

7/6  
AN  
ANSWER

TO AN

Heretical Book

Called the

Naked Gospel,

Which was condemned and ordered to be publicly  
burnt by the Convocation of the University of  
Oxford, Aug. 19. 1690.

With some Reflections on Dr. Bury's New  
Edition of that Book.

To which is added a short

HISTORY of Socinianism.

By William Nicholls, M. A. Fellow of Merton College in Oxford,  
and Chaplain to the Right Honourable Ralph  
Earl of Mountague.

*Ἀπερίσπυτον καὶ ἀκατάστατον τὸν ὅραμα πνεύματος. Greg. Nazianz. Orat. 25.*

*Ὁ μὲν δεξιὸς τῆς ἀγίας Τριᾶδος ἐν μίᾳ θεότητι ἰσχυροῦμαι οὕτως λέγει·  
στὰς ἀγίας, ἀλλ' ἄρα οὐκ ἐστὶν ἡ Ἀπερίσπυτος. Phot. Nomoc. Tit. 12. c. 2.*

LONDON,

Printed for Walter Kestilby, at the Bishop's Head in  
St. Paul's Church-Yard, 1691.

40

The wood.  
G. H. Newo

# ANSWER

TO A

Historical Book

Concerning

Political Economy

Which was first printed and sold to be publicly  
used by the University of

Windsor and Reprinted on Dr. Page's New  
Edition of the Book

By the same Author

JOHN G. F. JAMES

Printed by J. G. F. James, at the University of Windsor  
and Reprinted on Dr. Page's New Edition of the Book

Printed by J. G. F. James, at the University of Windsor  
and Reprinted on Dr. Page's New Edition of the Book

Printed by J. G. F. James, at the University of Windsor  
and Reprinted on Dr. Page's New Edition of the Book



1691  
M. 1  
The Epistle Dedicatory.

TO THE

Right Honourable

RALPH

EARL of

MOUNTAGUE, &c.

My Lord,

**I** Am induced to lay these Papers at your Lordship's Feet, both from the Relation I bear to your Lordship, which does exact all my Labours as a Tribute and Acknowledgment of my Duty and Obligation; as also from the Knowledge of the great Affection and Zeal You have always continued to shew for the True Religion; assuring my self that whatsoever shall be offered in Defence of that, especially against the now growing Heresie of the Times, will find no small Acceptance in your Lordship's Favour.

It is sufficiently known, my Lord, what a signal Example of True Christian Piety and Courage, against the *Anti-trinitarian* Heterodoxes, was shewn by the excellent

*The Epistle Dedicatory.*

\* S<sup>r</sup> Ralph  
Winwood's  
Remon-  
strance  
and Pro-  
testation  
to the  
States a-  
gainst Vor-  
stius's Ele-  
ction, in  
Wilson's  
Life of K.  
James.

Excellent Sir Ralph Winwood \*, your Lordship's Grandfather, when he was Embassadour in *Holland* for King *James I.* in so strenuously opposing *Vorstius* the *Socinian's* Accession to the Professorship of *Leyden*; whose Advice, if the *States* had then been so prudent as to have taken, the *Socinian* Heresies had not made the Progress in the World as now they have, from the Lectures of him and his Successours in that Chair. And therefore, my Lord, I am encouraged to think that your Lordship, who does possess all the Noble Endowments of that great and good Statesman, your Ancestor, will favourably look upon that which is designed against those Heretical Tenets, the Seeds of which have been mostly sown in this Nation by the Books of *Vorstius* and his Successours, though often under Colour of Opinions of a more specious Name.

May it therefore please your Lordship to accept these my poor Endeavours in Defence of the True Faith, which I have here presumed to entitle to your Lordship's Protection; and be pleased to look on them as a small Token of the Duty and Service which shall be always owing to your Lordship, from,

My Lord,

Your Lordship's

Most Dutiful Chaplain, and

most Obedient Servant,

*W. Nicolls.*

# THE PREFACE.

**T**HE occasion of writing this Treatise was to hinder the mischief that the Book it is designed to Answer was like to do, which having lain so many Months without an Answer, I did reasonably presume there was none design'd, and therefore I thought such a one as I could supply, would be better than none at all. I should never have troubled the World with this, if I had had the least *Item* of Mr. Long's design; but that was perfectly unknown to me till these Papers were wrote out fair for the Press.

As to the Method I have taken in the answering this Book, I have followed the Authour in his own, and have given *his* Titles to each of the Chapters. In those Chapters, in which he most impugns our Saviour's Divinity, I have traced him step by step, and given an Answer to every Shadow of an Argument that he brings. In other Chapters, where there are only oblique strokes against the Doctrine of the Trinity, or which are only Introductory to his main Design, I have only summed up the Substance of them, and so given an Answer to them in general; or at least to so much of them as seemed to make against the Truth of this Doctrine, or any other important Truth of our Religion. Now, it may, by some perhaps, be thought unfair, when I use these Expressions, *The Authour would insinuate, would pretend, &c.* when he does not, in express Terms, assert that thing in his Book. But it must be considered, That it was the Authour's design,  
not

## The PREFACE.

not to let his Book appear with too Heretical a Face, but to lay his Premises so, that the Reader should often draw his Consequences for him, without his setting them down in express Words. This is a Subtlety which is common to all such sort of Writers, that dare not speak out their full Minds; though, by the way, I think this Authour has as little minced the matter as any. But however, I have carefully endeavoured not to pervert his Sense; but to take his words in that meaning, which any indifferent Reader would think the Author designed they should be understood in. If I have any where mist his Meaning, 'tisthro' Mistake, and not thro' Wilfulness. And in truth, I am not absolutely sure, after the greatest Diligence, that I have always hit his Sense: for he has a peculiar way of Writing, different from all the Writers of the age, his Periods are long and uneven, filled with odd sort of Similes and affected Phrases, broken with unnatural *Parentheses*, and almost constant *Hyperbatons*; which, to be sure, will occasion Obscurity in his Book: so that if I have mistaken his Meaning upon this account, he is to charge that upon himself, and not upon his Answerer. In short, I have performed this Task, with all the fairness I could, with a design, not to triumph over my Adversary, but to evince the Truth; to vindicate the Honour of my Blessed Saviour, which was here so highly calumniated, and to assert the Doctrine of the Holy, undivided Trinity, into the belief of which I was baptized, and in which I hope, by God's grace, to die,

T. H.

# THE CONTENTS

## OF THE ANSWER to the PREFACE.

**T**HE Doctrine of the Trinity could give no encouragement to Mahometanism.

The true Reasons of the great prevailing of Mahomet's Religion.

Animadversion upon the Author's mistake about the establishment of Image-worship.

— Upon his saying Mahomet professed all the Doctrines of the Christian Faith.

The Heterodox greater furtherers of Mahometanism than the Orthodox.

That the belief of the Trinity is very consistent with the simplicity of the Christian Religion.

That the requiring a belief of this Doctrine does not suppose unlearned Men to understand all the disputes about it.

The Socinian Doctrines much fuller of niceties than the Orthodox.

### CHAP. I.

Necessary to be believed, and necessary to Salvation, not the same. The chief Rules of Christianity, not easily discernible by the light of nature, by instance of Tully and Aristotle.

Doctrine of the Trinity not contrary to the sameness of Christian Precepts.

How all the Gospel is Faith and Repentance?

### CHAP.



# The CONTENTS.

## CHAP. II.

*That we are justified by Faith alone, proved by Scripture, Antiquity, &c.*

*This Faith ought to be Orthodox in all fundamentals.*

*The reason why Faith is so pleasing to God, as to justify Men by it.*

## CHAP. III.

*What natural Faith is?*

*Faith under the Gospel is an inspired habit or grace, proved by Scripture, Antiquity, &c.*

*The Faith of Abraham and the Fathers, the true Christian justifying Faith.*

## CHAP. IV.

*Credulity not an excess of Divine Faith.*

*What deference is to be paid to General Councils.*

*That they cannot err, a pte Credibile.*

*They are the best expedients of Unity.*

## CHAP. V.

*The belief of Christ's Divinity, one of the difficulties in the planting the Gospel.*

*The belief of this frequently encouraged by our Saviour.*

*The belief of Christ's Divinity useful to Religion.*

1. *By gaining Authority to his Laws.*

2. *By improving our love and gratitude.*

3. *By assuring us of pardon.*

## CHAP. VI.

*Our Saviour's Titles not Hyperbolical.*

*Not called the Son of God, as a great Mountain is called the Mountain of God, &c.*

*He is not the Son of God as Angels are.*

*The splendor of his Nature no bar to our being certain of his Divinity.*

CHAP.



# THE CONTENTS

## CHAP. VII.

*The Authour's Testimony of Constantine, concerning the Doctrine of Christ's Divinity, examined.*

*Constantine's judgment of Arianism.*

*The supposition of a plurality of Worlds, no Argument that the Eternal Son of God should not dy for the sins of this.*

*No Argument against the Trinity, because it is not said expressly in Scripture, that every one to be baptized must believe in it.*

*The Ancient Christians, before Baptism, always instructed in this Doctrine.*

*A Testimony out of Justin Martyr examined.*

*A Testimony of Leonas in Socrates examined.*

## CHAP. VIII.

*Another Testimony of Constantine examined.*

*In what sense our Saviour's Original is unknown.*

*How Melchizedeck is a Type of Christ.*

*The Authour's saying, that the Evangelists do confound the Genealogies, on purpose to puzzle us, considered.*

*A Vindication of Bishop Alexander's contest with Arius.*

*A Citation out of Socrates concerning the question, examined.*

*Athanasius's explication of the Trinity defended.*

*Not absurd to believe a mystery.*

*Account of the proceedings of the Council of Synium.*

*No necessity, that Christ having two Natures, should have two Persons.*

*His being but one Person does not make him have but one Nature.*

*An account of the Condemnation of Eutyches.*

*An account of the Heretical Council at Ephesus that restored him.*

*The wickedness of the Eutychians in that Council.*

*The reason of the honour done to Leo in the Council of Chalcedon.*

*The favour granted to the Eutychians by Basiliscus, no Argument against the Orthodox Doctrine.*

## THE CONTENTS.

*'Monothelitism not owing to the Doctrine of the Trinity.  
An Account of the rise of it.*

### CHAP. IX.

*To assert our Saviour's Divinity, does not dishonour him by making him comprehensible.*

*An Account of the saying of the Council of Antioch, which the Authour alledges.*

*The Arians were never the less such for all their subscriptions to the Council of Nice.*

*A Vindication of Athanasius's flying to Julius the Roman Bishop, and of Julius.*

*An account of the Council of Sardica.*

*Athanasius purged from his pretended Crimes.*

*A Schism between the two Churches did not arise from the disagreement of the Arians, with the Orthodox at Sardica.*

*The troubles in the Church, not imputable to the Orthodox Doctrine.*

*The prevailing of the Orthodox Doctrine did not proceed from the greatness of the Bishop of Rome.*

*Nor from the ignorance of the Ancient Roman Church.*

*A Vindication of Theodosius's Decree for the establishing the Orthodox Doctrine.*

*Of Charity to Hereticks from the example of Alexander.*

*The ill consequences of Heresies, though not foreseen, yet imputable to it.*

*Arian and Socinian Expositions of Scripture unreasonable, to make the greater compellations of Christ's blood to the smaller.*

### CHAP. X.

*Of the Authour's Reflection on Dr. Hammond's Treatise of Fundamentals.*

*The Doctrine of the Trinity agrees with the Authour's first qualification of matter of Faith, viz. To be sufficiently understood by the meanest capacity.*

## THE CONTENTS.

*His second qualification considered that it must be the express word of God.*

*The Trinity proved by Scripture.*

*His third qualification considered.*

*Eternal Life promised to the belief of our Saviour's Divinity.*

*The use and necessity of Creeds in the Church.*

*The promise of eternal Life, not only made to the belief of the Resurrection.*

*Why this promise was made so expressly to that.*

### CHAP. XI.

*The necessity of Mens rising with the same numerical Bodies evinced, from Reason, Scripture, and Antiquity.*

*The Author's first Argument answered.*

*--His second.*

*His third.*

*His fourth.*

---

### ENQUIRY II.

*The Orthodox extend Faith no further than the Scripture does.*

*They do not exalt Faith above holiness.*

*Taking hold on Christ by Faith, imputed righteousness, &c. not phrases purely Calvinistical, but used by the Ancients.*

*We do not advance Faith above Charity.*

*How far our Charity to Hereticks is to extend.*

*The behaviour of the Ancient Christians to Hereticks.*

*We do not advance Faith above Reason.*

*The use of the word mystery in prophane Authors, in Scripture and Rabbers.*

*We use the word in the same sense it is used in Scripture.*

# THE CONTENTS.

## ENQUIRY III.

*The unfairness of the Authour in laying his charge against the  
Orthodox, and making it out against the Papists.  
The Doctrine of the Trinity not prejudicial to our Lord's honour,  
in hindring the progress of the Gospel.  
Not prejudicial to the Tranquillity of Christians Minds.  
--- nor to the peace of the Church.*

## Conclusion.

*That the Church of England does recommend the three Creeds to  
our Belief.  
The Authour's Arguments to the contrary answered.  
His reflection on the late Convocation considered.*

## ENQUIRY II.

CON-

---

# CONTENTS

OF THE

# REFLECTIONS

ON THE

## New Edition.

**T**HE Author's excuses for his first Book considered.

*His new Explication of the Trinity.*

*The Council of Alexandria did not condemn the words*  
*ὁμοία and ὑπόστασις.*

*Ομοία and Substantia, proper words to explain what is meant by*  
*them; and the Latins did understand by one what the Greeks did*  
*by the other.*

*The same shewn of ὑπόστασις and Persona.*

*None but the Hereticks refused these words.*

*The Doctor's Explication of the Trinity downright Sabellianism.*

*How Sabellius Explained the Trinity.*

*Δύο not explained by the Ancients by being the Wisdom of the*  
*Father.*

*Nor the Holy Ghost by being an Energy.*

*Neither St. Austin, nor Dr. Sherlock of our Author's Opinion.*

AN



# CONTENTS

## OF THE

# REFLECTIONS

### ON THE

## New Edition.

THE Author's apology for his first book contained  
 the new Edition of the *Principles*.  
 The Council of Alexandria did not condemn the words  
 used and interpreted.  
 Council of Sublimes, proper names to explain what is meant by  
 them, and the same are used by our own writers and  
 by the others.  
 The same sense of words and Relations.  
 None but the Physics respect this copy.  
 The Editor's Edition of the *Principles* is now published.  
 The Sublimes are printed in the same  
 style, not confined by the Editors to being the Wisdom of the  
 world.  
 Now the *Principles* being in English  
 Newton's *Principles*, not Dr. Stenoch's of our Author's Opinion.

AN



AN  
ANSWER  
TO THE  
PREFACE.

THE Author in this, by as much as can be gather'd from him, goes upon two Arguments to overturn the Doctrine of the Blessed Trinity; the first is, Because, as he pretends, the Disputes about this have been the decaying of Christianity, and the prevailing of Mahometanism in the East: the second is, Because, as he says, this Doctrine is contrary to the great Simplicity in which the Gospel was deliver'd, and, which it does recommend. In the proof of the first of these he spends half his Preface, and indeed has got through four of his long Columns, before he comes to any thing that looks like a Conclusion from his Premises. Soon he is admiring the swift Progress of Christianity through the World, notwithstanding the Power and Malice of its Adversaries, and the Meanness of its Propagators; and soon again he is as humble an Admirer of the good fortune of Mahomer's Religion; and withal, makes this most Christian conclusion, That the wonderful Progress of the Gospel was not a more powerful evidence of its Divine Authority, than the Progress of Mahometanism was for that of the Alchoran. But then again, upon second thoughts, he is a little for recalling himself, and gives the Advantage somewhat on the Gospel side, from the power of Arms, which the Arabian Doctor us'd, and something from the impurity of his Doctrines them-

## AN ANSWER to

*selfes, and the life of their Authour, whom he calls a lewd, brain-sick Scoundrel, with much more good manners and reverence than he termed our Saviour, just before, a crucified Vagabond. And then, a little after, he is so just to Christianity again, as to grant, that Mahometanism had not the advantage against her in truth of Doctrine, but only by permission of Divine Providence, which had predicted the removal of the Candlestick out of its place; but the great occasions of this removal, he tells us, were the great Innovations made in Christianity, and the hot Disputes, especially concerning the First and Second Persons of the Trinity; which had so changed the Gospel, that were an Apostle to return into the world, he would be so far from owning, that he would not be able to understand it; and so leaves it as a moot Point, whether Mahomet or the Christian Doctors have more corrupted the Gospel. Though at last he seems to determine it against the Doctors, and for Mahomet; because he allows him to have professed all the Doctrines of the Christian Faith, which the Doctors it seems had destroyed, and because their Doctrines (of the Trinity) had provoked our Lord to divorce himself from his Churches; and so did incourage, and empower the false Prophet to seduce and ruin them. This is the substance of half his Preface, the parts of which hang so loose, without any connection, and are so adly jumbled together, that I dare say, hardly ever any Man of Letters, before our Author, drew a Conclusion from premises so loosely laid; and I am afraid his Friends, the Socinians, are too great Lovers of Reason to hope for much credit or advantage to their Cause, from one that is so little a Master of ordinary Logic. For in all this jumble of words, here is not one tittle of proof of the thing he would be at; and what is worse, 'tis somewhat difficult to know what that is; all that one can guess from what he has been saying, is, That the determinations of the Councils, and the Writings and Disputes of the Fathers, concerning the blessed Trinity, against the Hereticks, were the chief causes of the prevailing of the Mahometan Religion. He mentions indeed with these the Doctrine of Image-worship, but that is only to shew the Doctrine of the Trinity in bad Company: for 'tis plain, by the tenour of his*

*Book,*

# the PREFACE

Book, that his design was not against the worship of Images: I shall therefore shew, First, That the Doctrine of the Trinity could give no occasion to the progress of Mahometanism or Servility. What were the occasions of the prevailing of it; and this, I presume, will be a full Answer to the first half of his Preface.

First, That the Doctrine of the Trinity could give no occasion to the progress of Mahometanism.

As for the Doctrine it self, I cannot see how that should gain Mahomet Profelytes, any more than any other Doctrine of Christianity: the Impostor himself disliked it, 'tis true; because as long as this Doctrine was believed, his pretended Revelations would never be received; for 'twould be in vain for him to offer to the World his Doctrines, which were contrary to those that were before delivered by the Eternal Son of God. He pretended to be no more than a meer Prophet, and therefore could never presume to undo what was believed to be settled personally by God himself. Besides the silliness of his arguing against the Generation of the Son, shewed, that he little understood the merits of that Cause, one of whose Arguments is, what Servertus \* the Reviver of this Author's Heresy, borrowed from him, because God, forsooth, † has no Wife. So that there is the same reason why this Deceiver should condemn this Doctrine of our Lord's Divinity, which obstructed his Ambition, as he did that of Christian Mortification and Self-denial, which obstructed his Lust. And the Author, with the same reason, might arraign all the admirable Lectures the holy Scripture gives us of Abstinence and Chastity for false Doctrine too, only because they were condemned by this Impostor. phrodims, &c. Serv. de Err. Trin. lib. 1. † Alch. cap. 15.

But as for the disputes about this Doctrine, at the time of Mahomet's appearing, they were well-nigh laid asleep, the Arian Doctrines were almost forgot by the eager disputes in the Apollinarian, Nestorian and Eutychian Controversies, and the Council of Chalcedon had fully determined the last Controversy-nigh 200 years before the World heard any thing of Mahomet. The number of the Arians at this time was very small, and they were chiefly at that time, according to \* Sandius himself, in Spain †, and then

Eccl. ad annum. † Where they were Condemned by the first Council of Toledo. An. 587.

## An ANSWER to

Disputes there could not give any great scandal to the Saracens on the other side the World. The greatest Controversies now on foot were in the East the Monothelites, or the Assertors of one Will in Christ; in the West was still remaining the Controversy about the Celebration of Easter. And these the Impostor takes no notice of, unless he includes them in the general, amongst the Divisions which he did condemn amongst the Christians. \*

\* Alch.  
Cap. 20.

2. Now secondly, As to the certain reasons why Mahometanism should with such a violent inundation of a sudden over-run the Eastern World, they can be known only to God himself, the great Disposer of all Events, whose Judgments are unsearchable, and his ways past finding out. But if we turn our Eyes upon second Causes, we may find several at this time, which either of themselves helped the spreading of this false Prophet's Impostures, or at least provoked God to permit this contagion to prevail. Which were first, The Calamitous Estate of Christendom at that time; nay, the whole World was under that commotion which it never felt before, and by God's Grace never may again. The Goths, and Huns, the Avars, Lombards and Bulgarians, were ravaging all the Western Empire, the Saxons not long before had over-run Britain, and the Persians were making as great devastations in the East; so that the Christians were not in a Capacity of resisting their other Enemies, much less of hindering the IncurSIONS of the Saracens. Secondly, The Negligence of the Popes and Patriarchs, who lay wrangling in the defence of their Errors, and in gaining Privileges and Precedencies to their Sees †, and did not lend any assistance

† A little before this time, according to Bede, A.D. 1512. the Supremacy and Title of Oecumenical Bishop was granted to Boniface the Third, by the wicked Parricide Phocas, who murdered his Master and Predecessour in the Empire, Mauritius.

towards the securing their Flocks from this Wolf, till 'twas past all recovery; and even the holy Wars which the Popes were so zealous for afterwards, seem'd designed more to keep the hands of active Princes a-work, lest they should attempt any thing against their See, or out of an odd Superstition to the Holy Land, and our Saviour's Sepulcher, than out of any truly pious design to revive Christianity. Thirdly, The Method he took to propagate his Religion by Fire and Sword; for he had no sooner Conquered any City or Country, but the poor wretched Inhabitants



## the PREFACE.

Inhabitants were forced to abnegate their former Religion, and to embrace his Forgeries, or \* else were immediately to be butcher'd by his <sup>\* Job. de Oppido. Vincentius. Alch. Cap. 52.</sup> Souldiers. Fourthly, But the great causes of all which provoked God to suffer the Candlesticks to be removed from these Churches, were, the great decay of Piety in the World, and the many Errours and Superstitions which had then crept into the Church, whose Doctrine and practice had then so vastly degenerated from those of the Christians in the first Ages. That Love and Charity, which was so exemplary in the Primitive Professors, was turned into Pride and Contention, and a pertinacious obstinacy in disputes and desire of Innovations, the former strictness and circumspectness of Life, was changed, after the peace in the Church under Christian Emperours, into dissoluteness and Luxury, and the other concomitants of those Vices. Errours and Superstitions were every day crowding into the Church, the Sacrifice of the Mass, Prayers for the Dead, Reliques, Doctrine of Merits, Prayers in an unknown Tongue, Purgatory, Prohibition of Marriage in the Clergy, Monastick Life, Superstitious Meats, Vests, Tonsures, &c. all which were brought in before, or in some measure used by this Age; and Image-Worship, which our Authour mentions, began a little to appear †, though it was far from settling till the second Council of Nice, A.D. 787. So that our Authour is a little out in his Chronology, when he says, the then late establishment of Image-worship, gave a tempting opportunity to the Impostor, &c. For that Impostor set on foot his Doctrines above 150 years before the establishment of Image-worship. For from the year 622, the year of Mahomet's flight, sometime after he had disseminated his Doctrines, to the year 787. are precisely 165 years, and so much the Authour is out of his Argument and his Chronology; unless he will allow the Arabian Doctor, by his prophetick Spirit, to have foreseen so far the determinations of this Council. And now, I hope, I have made it appear, that the determinations of the first Council of Nice, about the Trinity, which was 300 years before Mahomet, gave no more encouragement to his Imposture, than the second Council of Nice did, which was 150 years after; and if I have done so, I am very well contented.

† And Miracles pretended to be done by them. Niceph. Hist. Lib. 18. cap. 41, & 42.

I have

## AN ANSWER to

I have but one word more to say in vindication of the Orthodox Belief from this aspersions, which is, That I do not find any of her Professors to have been Abettors of Mahomet's Doctrine, but I wish our Authour's Friends, among the Heretodox, could say so much; for we read, that there assisted him in his Forgeries, one Sergius a Nestorian, and Johannes Antiochenus an Arian\*.

\* Zonaras

Tom. 3.

Paul. Diac.

Lib. 18.

Vincent.

Lib. 23.

† Vid. Steg-

mami Pho-

tintianif-

mum. Disp.

1. Q. 4.

Nay, 'tis a report commonly received, that Servetus borrowed his Heresy from the Mahometans in Africa †, so that it seems a Professor of the Arian Doctrine did assist in composing the Alchoran, and the Alchoran did conduce to the reviving of Arianism; and now let the Reader judge which have contributed more, the Orthodox or the Hereticks, to the propagation of Mahomet's Religion. As to his Unchristian assertion, that Mahomet professed all the Doctrines of the Christian Faith, which the University have Condemned in their Decree, it may be expected I should say something to that; but that is an expression so horrid in all Christian Ears, that it needs no Antidote; 'tis a Blasphemy so loud and palpable, that it exacts rather the Iron of the Hangman, than the Answer of a Christian. Blessed Jesus! that ever thy holy Religion should be thus vilified! that a Christian should assert, that such a profligate Wretch, that carried on his Impostures by Villainy and Lewdness, that tolerated in his Followers, Murders and Thefts, Rapes and Sodomies, and was himself most eminent in all these wickednesses, that he should be said by a Christian to profess all the Articles of thy holy Religion, which commands the utmost goodness and purity, both of Body and Soul.

II. The second Argument which our Authour goes upon to invalidate the Doctrine of the Trinity is, because, as he would insinuate, it is contrary to the simplicity of the Gospel. And in proving of this he uses as much prevarication and shuffling, as if he had been trained up in a College of Jesuits. For when he should shew his Reader, how much the Doctrine of three Persons, being one God, is contrary to the Gospel simplicity, he runs off from this to several other corruptions which have happened to the Gospel, and which the maintainers of this Doctrine are not the least concerned to answer for. 'Tis one of the excellencies of the Christian Religion, as he

well



## the PREFACE

well observes, that the poor have the Gospel preached unto them; that is, that the Doctrines of the Christian Religion are such, as the meanest capacities may understand; the Truths which it does deliver are not strange Philosophical notions, or expressed in high, Rhetorical strains, or (as the Apostle speaks) in enticing words of Mans Wisdom. But how does he prove that it may not be so for all the Doctrine of the Trinity? Why, the Authour is pretty civil as to that point, and because he would not be too hard upon the Orthodox, turns the point of his Argument against the old Gnosticks, and fetches a Text or two out of St. Paul to confound them. If any one preach another Jesus whom we have not preached --- you might well bear with him, or as the Authour translates it, could you well bear with him? 2 Cor. 11. 1. Which, by the way, is a false translation: for there is no Authority for any such reading by way of Interrogation. The words in the Text are *καλὸς νωκεαδε* ye might well bear, without the word him. And if our translation were to be altered, it ought rather to be, you might well bear with me; for that is most agreeable to the Apostle's design: for he is desiring the Corinthians to excuse his boasting, as V. 1. *καλὰ ἐσιν* and I pray bear with me. The like he endeavours to prove from Gal. 1. 6. I marvel that ye are so soon removed from him that called you into the grace of Christ unto another Gospel, which is not another. If an Angel from Heaven preach any other Gospel, let him be accursed. From all which he draws these four Theses.

First, 'Tis possible the Gospel may be so disguised by Innovations, that though it still retain its genuine Principles, it may appear another.

Secondly, 'Tis possible such Innovations may be so obvious, that people may discover them.

Thirdly, Those that depart from such Innovators are not Schismatics, but faithful Believers.

Fourthly, Be the Innovators never so high in Authority, we must be so far from paying them Implicit Faith, that we must not pay them ordinary Charity, but hold them accursed.

The Authour has been here at a great deal of pains to lay his  
matter.

## An ANSWER to

*matter in order, though I believe it will make little to his purpose. For we will grant all that he has been here saying is true, if he lets the matter lie, as the Apostle left it, against the Gnosticks. Nay, but perhaps the Trinitarians will not so easily get off here. And truly any one that understands the design of the Authour's Book, would expect from these Propositions some wonderful confutation of the Trinitarian Doctrines. But our Authour very cunningly lets that alone, and by a Hocus-Pocus trick, claps before our Eyes some Romish corruptions, which were occasioned, he tells us, by people that heaped to themselves Teachers, having itching Ears, and those Teachers heaped to themselves Doctrines to scratch that itch; and so the Monks by scratching and clawing one another, scratched themselves into all the errours of the School-Divinity. Therefore he concludes, that there being such errours that destroy the Gospel simplicity, and we being not to be saved by the greatest humane authority (he means general Councils) or to put our Souls in a Lottery; we must therefore see what those Doctrines are, which destroy the Gospel simplicity; which cannot better be managed, he tells us, than by the three enquiries of his Book.*

*Now though for all the Authour has said to this point, the Doctrine of the Trinity is very safe, yet because he would slyly insinuate, that this Doctrine is one of those Romish Errours that destroy the simplicity of Christianity, I think fit to make him this Answer.*

*First, That the belief of the blessed Trinity is very consistent with the simplicity of the Christian Religion. For if there be nothing in that Doctrine, but what a Man of ordinary capacity may understand, as much at least as is requisite for his belief, and as far as his judgment tells him 'tis reasonable to suppose such a thing should be understood; I cannot see why this Doctrine should derogate from the simplicity of Christianity. Now First in this doctrine there is nothing but what a Man of mean parts may understand, as far as is requisite for his belief; for 'tis not requisite that such a Man (or indeed any Man) should fully understand all that he does believe; for that would not be belief but science: 'tis enough for belief, that a Man has undoubted Testimony that such a thing is*  
so,

## the PREFACE

so, whether he understands the manner, or perhaps the possibility of its being so or not. We are wont to take many things upon Trust from the Mouths of Men learned in their respective Sciences; the reasons of which we are far from understanding; and Mathematicians can demonstrate many Truths, and which Men unlearned in their Science take upon their words, though to them they seem otherways impossible. Now if it be reasonable, that a plain unlearned Man should believe many things which he does not understand from the testimony of wiser and more knowing Men, I think it a less imposition upon the understandings of plain Men, to require them to believe a revealed Truth from the Testimony of the All-wise and All-knowing God. Secondly, A plain Man understands as much in this Doctrine, as his judgment tells him it is reasonable he should understand in a matter of that nature; and 'tis highly unreasonable for any Man to expect more. If any one indeed, how wise soever, should tell the plain Man that Bread is Flesh, the plain Man would think this unreasonable to believe; because he knows the difference between Bread and Flesh, as well as any one can tell him; and because then he is required to disbelieve his Senses in a matter of which they are the properest Judges. But if this plain Man be informed, by an undoubted Testimony, of something which indeed he does not understand concerning God; whose nature and essence his reason tells him is not to be understood, or any one else, though of the greatest learning or reason; this he is with an humble submission ready to believe, and when he has full assurance of the undoubtedness of the Testimony which confirms this, his belief does not in the least boggle at what is so delivered. For a Person of the ordinaryest reason that believes a God and his Attributes, must be sure, that in that infinite being there are infinite mysteries, that is, Truths which are not to be understood by finite capacities; and if it has pleased God's Wisdom, to reveal the Esse of one of these mysteries to us, that there are Father, Son and Holy-Ghost, three Persons and one God; though the Modus of this Truth does surpass our understandings, yet he acknowledges, that this belief is reasonable, because 'tis irrational for him so to think his finite understanding should comprehend all the mysterious Truths in an infinite Deity.

C

Secondly,

Secondly, *Ti* wants requisite that every plain simple Man, of whose the belief of the Trinity is required, as being a divine Truth revealed in Scripture; that he should understand all the Questions, which are controverted by learned Men about this Doctrine: All the disputes about Hypostasis's and Personalities, Generations and Processions; for there were thousands of good Christians went to Heaven before these Controversies were started in the World, or before these terms were ever heard of. So that 'tis a great mistake of the Adversaries of this Doctrine, to think that we impose it as necessary to every ordinary Man's Salvation to understand, and to give an express assent to all the determinations of these Questions: 'tis enough for him to believe the Doctrine in general, as he finds it revealed in Scripture; and to leave the more particular disquisition of it to more learned Men. And besides, 'tis not the fault of the Orthodox in the Church, that even these Disputes happened, or that ever these names were coined: we may thank the Hereticks for all this, for they began first to oppugn the received Faith by new Doctrines and strange glosses upon Scripture, and then the true Christians, in their own defence, were forced to vindicate the Orthodox Faith; and so because by reasoning upon supernatural Truths, which never came into so strict disquisition before, they had occasion to invent new words to express these Truths by, to prevent long ambages and circumlocutions in discourse; or otherwise the World had never been troubled to this day with Hypostasis's, Homoeousios's, or Consubstantiality. But after all this clamour against the Orthodox, the Socinians themselves (not to mention the Arians) build their points of Faith upon greater niceties, or else how come they to bring in their *o, n, ro* into Divinity? that *o* without *o* should signify the supreme God, but not with it; which is a false as well as a foolish Criticism. Or else how come they to make use of that pretty distinction of a God by Nature, and a God by Office?

Then follow his three Queries, in which he promises to act no less sincerely than courageously, but I am afraid he has failed in the former; for if, I mistake not, his Confidence has generally the transcendent of his Sincerity, which is the common fate of all Hereticks. His Queries are these.

I. What



## the PREFACE.

1. *What was that Gospel which our Lord and his Apostles preached as necessary to be believed?*
2. *What alterations or additions have after Ages made in it?*
3. *What Advantage or Damage hath thereupon ensued.*

Now as to these *Queries*, I am willing to follow him in the search of them; and I pray God to give him grace to be better resolved in them hereafter, than he was, or at least would be thought to be, when he was writing this Book. And so I shall take my leave of his Preface.

---

C 2

AN





AN  
ANSWER  
TO THE  
**Naked Gospel.**

CHAP. I.

*What was the Gospel our Lord and his Apostles preached, as necessary to Salvation.*

**H**ERE the Author shews a little Sophistry, whilst in his Query at first he says *necessary to be believed*, but in his transcribing it in the Front of this Chapter, he says *necessary to Salvation*. The first expression he uses, as the more soft, to make his Queries, as they lie together, seem more reasonable; the second he makes use of, as the more harsh, thereby to insinuate the uncharitableness of the Orthodox, who make a right Belief of the Trinity necessary to Salvation. Now, though we will not quarrel with the Author about this change of his Terms, which is never to be allowed in fair Disputes, especially in the Question it self, which is to be discussed; yet we must allow a great deal of Difference between a thing's being necessary to be believed, and being necessary to Salvation. A thing may be necessary to be believed, when it is a certain Truth plainly revealed in Scripture; so that a man cannot, in all points, believe aright without the belief of that too, and the belief of that Point is necessarily required to make him a full, compleat, Orthodox Believer; but then, a thing is necessary for Salvation, when it is so of the very Fundamentals of Religion, that the Scripture does not allow of Salvation without the belief of this; but whether the Doctrine of the Blessed

## 3

A  
 r  
 E  
 f  
 t  
 L  
 M  
 t  
 o  
 t  
 m  
 o  
 H  
 v  
 c  
 L  
 g  
 w  
 C  
 u  
 B  
 f  
 d  
 s  
 m  
 t  
 f  
 i  
 a  
 s  
 h  
 I  
 i  
 g  
 t  
 h  
 i  
 S  
 a  
 b  
 T  
 A  
 a  
 g

head, and this fall as he came in his hand, y  
as he safely may, so he may with his sword.

1919

\* Socinus *Præf. 3. ejusd.*  
*Respons. ad Jac. Balcol. cap.*  
*4. Crell. in Matt. 5. Ludo.*  
*Wassengenii Compend. Christ.*  
*Relig. p. 2. in edit. Fratrum*  
*Pol.*

something which they knew well enough before, and which any Ignorant Man, in our Author's phrase, could understand without an Instructor. Who the Authour calls ignorant Men I know not; I am sure, some Men of the greatest natural Knowledge have not been able, by the light of Nature, to come up to the Knowledge of some of those Laws which our Saviour does recommend in his Sermon upon the Mount. The Jews, who one would think should be most knowing in these Truths, as having the assistance of so many particular Revelations, yet they lived in opinions contrary to them all, as appears by the whole tenor of that Discourse of our Saviour; and even the most Learned of the Heathen were far from embracing the generality of them. 'Twould be too long here to shew the great defect of the Heathen Philosophy, in respect of this admirable Lecture of our Saviour: But to let our Authour know how far ignorant Men are from coming up, by the pure light of reason, to the Knowledge of these Laws, let him consider how much Aristotle and Cicero, two Men of the greatest strength of natural Reason, perhaps, that ever were in the world; how much, I say, these great men were mistaken in the Rules of Charity which our Blessed Saviour does deliver. He commands us to love our enemies, to do good to them that hate us, Matth. 5. 44.

But \* Aristotle tells us, that That man is void of all sense and pain; that, though he does forbear to be angry, does not seek revenge. But 'tis the part of a Slave, being contumeliously used, to bear it. So Cicero, among the rights of Nature, places Revenge, † by which, says he, we propel an Injury or an Affront. And again in one of his Epistles to Atticus he shews his Practice as well as his Opinion. ‡ I hate the man, and I will hate him, and I wish I could be revenged of him. Now I suppose Cicero and Aristotle were none of the most ignorant men; and, if they could not search out these Truths without an Instructor, I cannot imagine how our Authour's ignorant Men should. So that, in short, this opinion of our Authour's is not Socinianism, but 'tis Socinianism reversed; 'tis a Heterodoxy of his own coining; 'tis such an odd piece of stupid Heresie, as not only his beloved Rationalists, but even his ignorant Christians will be ashamed of.

Secondly, As to what he would infer, That the Doctrine of the Trinity is contrary to the plainness of the Gospel, I have given an Answer already to that when I considered his Preface. I shall only add, That the Doctrine of our Saviour's Divinity should, I think, give greater Credit and Authority to his Laws; and ordinary Christians

Αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ ἀδικῶν  
ἀδικεῖ καὶ οὐκ ἐκδικεῖται  
ἀλλὰ ἀφ' ὧν ἐκδικεῖται  
τὸ δὲ  
ἐκδικεῖται ἀπὸ τοῦ  
ἀδικῶν. Arist. de Mor.  
ad Nicom.  
¶ Per quam vim aut contumeliam defendendo aut ulciscendo propalamus. Cic. de Invent. lib. 1.  
¶ Odi hominem & odoro: utinam ulcisci possim. Cic. Epist. ad Att. lib. 1.

rians should sooner believe and practise them upon account of their having so admirable and divine an Authour.

Thirdly, As to the Doctrine of the Trinity its being contrary to the fewness of the Christian Doctrines, which our Authour would have but Two at most, Faith and Repentance: I answer, 'Tis true, Faith and Repentance, in a large acceptation, are the Summ of the Christian Religion: and 'tis as true, That the Doctrine of the Trinity is neither Faith nor Repentance by way of Identical Predication; but, I hope, it may be contained under one of them as a *species* under its *Genus*. Faith and Repentance, in a large sense, do take in all Christianity; under one are contained the *Credenda*, and under the other the *Agenda* of our Religion. But then, what is this to our Authour's purpose? If it be any thing it must be this, Our Saviour has reduced all his Religion to Faith and Repentance; nay, sometimes to each of them: *Ergo*, the Doctrine of the Trinity ought not to be believed, or those that teach that Doctrine preach another Gospel. Now, how glorious a piece of Logick is this! Would not this be as good a Conclusion to all intents and purposes? *Aristotle* tells us, That all things in the world are Substance or Accident; nay, he has reduced both these to *Ens*; therefore there is no such thing as *Homo* or *Brutum*; or therefore he that says so teaches another Philosophy than *Aristotle*. Certainly every one that understands any thing of his Religion must know, That Faith, in this general acceptation, must take in a firm Belief of all things necessary to Salvation, a stedfast Trust and Reliance upon God, and an undoubted Hope in all his Promises, and an expresse Assent to all Truths he has revealed in his word, &c. and that Repentance does contain not only a bare turning from Sin, but a constant Practice of all Christian Vertues. So that our Authour, by this Argument, might have as well proved Hope and Charity to be no Christian Graces, that there is no such Vertue under the Gospel as Temperance or Chastity, because our Saviour has only preached Faith and Repentance.

## CHAP. II.

### Of Faith, in what Sense it justifies.

OUR Authour, in the beginning of this Chapter, is of a sudden turned pretty Orthodox, and falls a-disputing very shrewdly against the *Gnosticks* and *Antinomians*: and then he applauds himself mightily,



mightily, in his bringing an Illustration out of *Act. 27. 18.* of St. Paul's saying to the *Centurion*, *Except the Mariners stay in the ship, we cannot be saved*, when he had told them before, that there should not be the loss of any Man's life; now, by this Instance, he illustrates the Necessity of good works to Justification; and tells us, that by this all the Questions about Justification may be solved; though he knows not of any one before him, which has honoured it with a mention. I shall not go about to disturb him in his dispute against the *Antinomians*, though I think 'tis a little unseasonable in this Place; nor shall I go to rob him of the honour of his Instance, nor that place of Scripture of the honour of his Mention: for I don't remember I have read it used in this Controversie before; though I am sure it has been urged with greater Advantage against the Patrons of absolute Predestination. And now one would think the Authour had a mind to have a little Controversie with *Luther*, or *Calvin*, or *Bellarmino*, or to state the Question of Justification among the Moderns; but truly he leaves it just as he finds it, and runs off to a long Indictment he has drawn up against Faith, by which, I suppose, he would prove its Ineffectualness to Justification. Which, in short, he brings to this Dilemma: Either by Faith, we believe what is reasonable, and so we can't help it, and then we have no pretence to a Reward; or else, we believe without Reason, and then we are Fools: *Ergo*, We are not justified by Faith.

One may be apt to wonder to what purpose the Authour should bring in this Question into his Book; for one would think, at first sight, that the decision of it for Works, would make more for the *Papists*; than the *Anti-trinitarians*: But yet, upon second thoughts, one may easily find, that the Authour was aware that the usual Solution of this Question, by the merits of Christ who is our Righteousness, would too far advance his Satisfaction, and consequently his Divinity; and that, for a true Justification by Faith, there would be required a full, Orthodox Belief in all Fundamentals: and therefore, this Chapter was, I suppose, to obviate these Objections. Though, for ought I can see, there is nothing proved against any but the *Antinomians*, unless he would have all such that are not *Socinians*. But because the Authour does here endeavour to destroy the Effectualness of this divine Grace, the express Attestation of God's word, the constant Suffrage of the Church, and the Satisfaction too of our Saviour's sufferings. I shall give him an Answer, by shewing these three things; which, I suppose, will be a compleat Answer to this whole Chapter.

First, That we are justified by Faith alone.

D

Secondly,



*Secondly, That this Faith must be Orthodox in all Fundamentals.*

*Thirdly, To give a Reason why Faith is so pleasing to God, as to justify men by it.*

*First, We are justified by Faith alone.*

There cannot be any thing more expressly asserted in Scripture, than that we are justified by Faith onely. *The righteousness of God, which is by Faith in Jesus Christ, is revealed unto all and upon all that believe, Rom. 3. 22. And v. 24. Being justified freely by his Grace. And v. 30. It is one God, that justifieth the circumcision by Faith, and the uncircumcision by Faith. And so chap. 5. v. 1. Being justified by Faith, we have peace with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ. And so Eph. 4. 8. By grace ye are saved through Faith, and not of your selves;*

\* Art. 11.  
Vid. Hom.  
of Justifi-  
cation.

*it is the gift of God, and not of works, least any one should boast. And our Church informs us, \* That to be justified by Faith onely, is a whole-  
some Doctrine, and full of Comfort.* Besides, this has been the

† Δικαιοσύνη ὅς τὸ  
πιστεύει μόνον. Bas. Hom.  
de Humil. Δικαιοσύνη ἡ  
σὴν ἡμεῖς τῷ Θεῷ. Chrys. Hom.  
2. in Rom. Vid. Orig. ad Rom.  
lib. 4. Hilar. can. 8. in Matt.  
Ambros. in 3. Rom. Theod.  
Therap. 7°. Hieron. in 4.  
Rom. August. cont. ep. Pe-  
lag. Chrysol. ferm. 34. Theo-  
phyl. 9. Rom. Oecum. in  
1. Rom. p. 250.

|| Article 12.

\* Homil.  
Salv. part  
3.

*speaks, \* sends us directly to Christ for the remission of our Sins, and by which we embrace the Promise of God's Mercy and of the remission of our Sins; which thing none other of our Vertues or Works properly doth, therefore the Scripture useth to say, That Faith without Works doth justify. Not that even Faith it self is a proper and necessary cause of Justification; but that it has pleased God to accept it as a cause or means, by embracing or taking hold of the merits of Christ, which are the true, proper, meritorious cause of Justification. Which justification or righteousness, which we so receive of God's mercy and Christ's merits, embraced by Faith, is taken, accepted, and allowed of by God as our perfect and full Justification. And this is the reason that the Gentlemen of the Authour's perswasion are so unwilling to have Faith onely to justify.*

Homil.  
Salv. part  
1.

*Secondly,*

## the Naked Gospel.

7

*Secondly*, This ought to be an Orthodox Faith, in all Fundamentals at least

All the admirable Effects, which the Scripture does attribute to Faith, must be understood of a true Faith, such as is agreeable to God's word, which is to be the rule of our Faith, and not of a false or Heterodox Faith, which any one takes up from a Party of Men, or from his own Imagination. A Heterodox Faith is no more Faith than a dead man or a painted man is a Man, they agree in one common equivocal Name, 'tis true, and in nothing else. So that an Heterodox Faith can no more pretend to those supernatural Effects, which a true Faith, by God's grace, does produce, than a dead Man can pretend to all the Properties and Operations of a live one. There is but one Faith as well as one Baptism; so that to hope to be justified by a false or another Faith, is as unreasonable as to expect to come into the Church by another Baptism. So that they that teach a Justification by works, or any other Faith than an Orthodox one, do themselves, for ought as I see, *teach another Gospel*.

*Thirdly*, The reason why Faith is so pleasing to God, as that he should make this the great Means of Justification.

And here I hope to give an Answer to the Authour's Dilemma; and to shew that our Faith in Christ is not irrational, and then *we are no Fools*, and as for our merit by Faith, we are far from pretending to it: we acknowledge it as an infinite mercy of our gracious God, that he will accept our Faith in Christ's blood for our Justification, and do not go about to argue the worth of it, which is none. And as for the grounds of our Faith in Christ for Justification, I know not what can be more reasonable, than to expect only to have our weak Performances accepted, for the sake of his all-sufficient Merits. And of all our Actions that we can perform, I know not what can be more pleasing and acceptable in the sight of God, than for an humble and desponding Christian, considering his own unworthiness and the insufficiency of his Repentance it self, and all other Vertues, to incline God to mercy, so far as for their sakes to accept him for just and innocent, he, as the last refuge he hath, quitteth all worth and merit in himself and fleeth with a full and undoubting Faith in all God's revelations, and a firm confidence in all his promises, unto the free grace of God revealed in Christ Jesus, and hopes, for the sake of his Righteousness alone, that he will justify his imperfect Performances. This certainly, when we have done the utmost of our Endeavours, is more pleasing to God than any action we can do more. For if we could be justified by our works, it would tempt us to reflect with Pride upon our vertuous Actions; but this teaches us a pious

despondency in our selves, and to cast all our hopes upon our blessed Saviour. And this is the summ of the Apostles Arguments, *Eph. 2. 8. For by Grace ye are saved through Faith, not of your selves, nor of works, least any one should boast.* And the learned \* *Cassander*, though a Papist, says thus much in favour of this Doctrine of the Protestants, *that in this Question, by the word Faith, they mean only the grace of God which is correspondent to faith (quæ fidei ex adverso respondet); and to be justified by faith alone, signifies the same as by grace alone, in opposition to all kind of works.*

\* *Georg. Cassand. in Consil. de Art. 4. Aug. Confess. p. 18.*

### CHAP. III.

*What figure Faith made in natural Religion?*

OUR Authour, in the beginning of this Chapter, lays down Faith as a duty in natural Religion, that it is a branch of Justice, by which we pay to God what is due to his Veracity; that this was before all positive Law, and that upon this the Gospel is built; because the Faith of *Abraham* (which is recommended for our pattern, *Rom. 4.*) was nothing else but this Justice; that the lack of this Faith was reproved by the Angel in *Sarah*, and was punished in *Lor's Wife*, *Gen. 18.* and in the incredulous Lord, *2 King. 7.* And that this is the Faith lastly which is commended in the Worthies mentioned, *Heb. 11.* And last of all he endeavours to shew the excellency of *Abraham's* Faith, to consist in believing God against so many difficulties, from this natural notion of his Veracity.

Any one that understands the nature of the Authour's Book, will easily see into his design here; which is to bring down all Faith to be a meer Creature of Reason, to be no longer that which the Schools call an infused Habit, or the inspiration of God, but only a bare rational belief upon divine Testimony. Now as to his notion of Faith, its being a branch of Justice, and that by the light of nature we are taught to believe God upon his Testimony; this is in some measure most certainly true, as appears by the practice of the Heathens themselves †, who had nothing but the light of nature to walk by, in their believing their Oracles, Anguries, Prophecies, &c. and in suiting their actions according to them. So that 'tis plain, that natural Re-

† *Testimoniorum quæ sunt genera? Divinum & Humanum.*

*Divinum ut Oracula, ut Auspicia, ut vaticinationes & responsa Sacerdotum, Aruspicum, Conjecturæ. Cic. Orat. Partic.*

ligion

ligion tells us, God is to be believed upon his Testimony; so that when a Man under natural Religion does believe any thing upon God's Testimony, our Authour may, if he pleases, call this Faith. But Theological Faith, or Faith under the Gospel, is quite of another kind; this is not only an assent of the understanding, but a divine Grace, or Habit infused, though our Authour would have them the same, by saying the Gospel is built upon this: and moreover, That Faith in Abraham, which the Scripture does recommend for our Pattern, was not this bare rational assent but an inspired Vertue, that was founded and excited in him by the preventing and co-operating Grace of God.

1. For first, *Faith under the Gospel is a spiritual Grace, or an inspired Habit, 'tis a true and stedfast belief in, and reliance upon God, through the merits of Jesus Christ, and the sanctification of the holy Spirit, not by the bare assent only of our reason, but by the co-operating Grace of God.* I know not for my part any truth in all our Religion more expressly revealed, than that Faith is a Grace inspired by God. It is said to be the gift of God, Eph. 2. 8. And again, *for unto you is given in the behalf of Christ, not only to believe on him but to suffer for him,* Eph. 1. 29. Upon Peter's confessing our Saviour's Divinity, Christ tells him, *flesh and blood hath not revealed this unto thee, but my Father which is in Heaven,* Matth. 16. 17. *We are not sufficient of our selves to think anything as of our selves, but our sufficiency is of God,* 2 Cor. 3. 5. *It is God that worketh in us both to will and to do,* Phil. 2. 13. *No man can come unto me except the Father which sent me draw him,* Joh. 6. 4. And so Gal. 5. 22. Faith is reckoned among the gifts of the Spirit. And the Father of the *Demoniack*, Mark 9. 24. cries out, *Lord, I believe, help my unbelief.* Now if all our Vertues and good thoughts are the effects of God's Grace, most certainly this eminent Vertue of Faith must; if the Inspiration of God be requisite, even for St. Peter's Faith, it must surely likewise be so for ours; if we are to be drawn to the belief of the Gospel by God, we cannot come then upon our own pure accord; if the belief of one that was an Eye-witness of our Saviour's Miracles, did lack help and improvement from God, ours likewise cannot stand in need of less. I do not say, that God inspires this belief into us without any concurrence of our own judgments, that he moves our Assents as if we were meer Machines; but his preventing Grace does first excite our belief, and his assisting Grace does still further it, by giving a blessing and effectualness to the word; and without this divine assistance, according to the present measures of God's dispensations, it is impossible we should ever attain it. For the certainty of this divine truth we have Scripture,

\* Councils,



\* *Concil.* \* *Councils*, † *Fathers* and Learned Men in all Ages, the || *Doctrine* of our own Church, and all sober Christians; but only a few  
 cap. 4. & \* *Socinians* and *Remonstrants* that are for levelling all Scripture and  
*Conc. carth.* Revelations to their own sense and humour. Nay, I am apt to think  
 7. *Concil.* that this Doctrine will be look'd upon as too Calvinistical by some;  
*Araus. cap.* 6, 7, & 23. since the Systems of the † *Remonstrants*, which condemn this Doctrine  
 † *καὶ ὁ αὐτός* are so admired in the world; but 'tis not Systems, but God's word,  
 † *τὸ τὸ αὐτό* we are to be governed by; and from hence we have proof enough to  
 † *ἐκείνου* maintain this Doctrine against all the *Remonstrants* and *Socinians* in  
 † *τοῦ κόσμου* the World.

*Chrys. lib. de Virgin. cap. 42.* καὶ ἡ πίστις ἡ ἀρχαία τὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἔχει. Theophyl. in  
 1 Cor. 2. *Græc. Deum gratia spiritualis est.* Amb. citante August. contra 2 Ep. Pelag. cap. 11.  
*Munus in fide manendi à Deo esse.* id. Com. in Matt. Vid. Com. ejusdem in Psal. 123. Theophyl. in  
 1 Eph. Clem. Alex. Strom. 2. Chrys. 1 Cor. cap. 4. v. 7. And indeed this was the unanimous  
 Doctrine of the ancient Church, and none were for our Authour's Opinion of Natural Faith,  
 that I can find, but only the Followers of the Heretick *Basilides*; who, as *Clemens* says of them,  
*οὐκ ἔχουσιν ἡγῆσθαι τὴν πίστιν*, did look upon Faith as only natural. Clem. Alex. Strom. 2. p. 362.  
 || *Cum Homo assentiendo his quæ sunt fidei elevatur supra naturam suam, oportet, ut hoc insit ei ex*  
*supernaturali principio ipsum movente, quod est Deus;* & ideo fides quatenus ad assensum, qui est prin-  
 cipalis actus fidei, est à Deo interius movente per gratiam. Thom. 22. Qu. 6. Art. 1. Vid. Schol. omnes  
 in lib. 3. sent. \* Vid. Socin. *Crellium*, &c. in *Fratr. Pol. & Libros Remonstr.* † Vid. *Episc. Insit.*  
 lib. 4. cap. 11. *Curcellæum* & *Limbours*, in cap. de Fide.

2. Now as to his making the Faith of *Abraham*, by which he is said  
 in Scripture to be justified, to be only a natural Faith; I answer, First,  
 Though we should not allow this Faith of *Abraham* to be the true  
 Christian Justifying Faith, or a Faith in Christ Jesus; yet we cannot  
 allow it to be only a plain moral Act or Habit: for if it were only a  
 bare credence out of Justice to God's Veracity, that too must be al-  
 lowed to come from God, because without him we are not able to  
 think a good thought, much less to do a good action. Though by the  
 light of Natural Religion a man might be convinced that it was his  
 duty to believe God in all his promises; yet when these promises,  
 by their difficulties, seem strangely incredible, Flesh and Blood will  
 be apt to shrink and give way, and rather to fall a disputing the  
 possibility of them, than readily, upon God's Authority, to be-  
 lieve; unless their Faith be strengthened by the assisting Grace of  
 of God's holy Spirit. And so \* *Philo* the Jew says in this case of  
*Abraham*, That 'tis not so easie a matter to believe in God alone, by rea-  
 son of that cognation we have with that Mortal part we are yoked to,  
 which is the cause that we trust in Money and Glory, in Honours and  
 Friends, and the like; but to be purged from all these, and to distrust  
 all created things, which are unfaithful in themselves, and to trust in God  
 alone, who is always faithful, μεγάλους ἢ θανόντων διανοίας ἔργον ἐστίν, is the  
 work of a great and heavenly Mind, that is, an inspired one.

\* *Philo*  
 lib. quis re-  
 rum divina-  
 rum Hæres.

Secondly,



Secondly, But besides, this Faith of Abraham was a formal, Christian, justifying Faith, or a Faith in Christ Jesus. It was the opinion of the Ancients, That all the Patriarchs and all other Good Men, both before and under the Law, were saved by an express Faith in Christ.

\* Eusebius tells us, That all the Fathers before Abraham were Christians, though not in Name, yet in reality; and that they followed the Faith of him whom we now follow. And † St. Hierom, That the Saints that were of old, were justified by Faith in Christ. And || St. Gregory, That as we are saved by Faith in the past Passion of our Saviour, so the ancient Fathers by Faith in his Passion which was then to come.

\* Cyril goes farther, and makes Abraham, from the seeing of the three Angels, to have believed in the Consubstantial Trinity. And if we look into Scripture, we shall find that these great Men had reasons enough to ground them in this Opinion: for our Saviour tells the Jews, Joh. 8. 56. Your fathers Abraham, rejoiced to see my day, and he saw it and was glad. Now, what should all this gladness and rejoicing be for? but that from the Promise which God had made him, Gen.

11. 35. that in his seed all the nations of the earth should be blessed: he was fully persuaded, That God, in his good time, would send such a Person as Christ into the world, that should save the People from their Sins, that should die for the Sins of the whole world, to reconcile them to God; now the consideration of this was matter of the greatest Joy to him then, as it is now to all good Christians: so that (as St. Gregory says) there is little difference in this between his Faith and ours, but that ours is after and his before Christ's Passion. So likewise St. Peter tells the Jews, Act. 4. 12. Neither is there Salvation in any other but Christ, for there is no other Name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved. Now, whereas 'tis certain, by Scripture, that these good Patriarchs were saved, as appears by God's declaring himself to be their God, and by making a lying down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob to be an expression for Everlasting Happiness; it from hence follows, That they must be saved by a Faith in Christ, or else they would be saved by Faith in another Name. I say, They must be saved by Faith in his name; for that is the onely Means of Salvation God has proposed. That was one of the express terms of Reconciliation agreed upon with the Father to be performed on Man's part; so that they could reap no benefit from this Covenant, without performing that condition.

As to his other Instances to prove Faith in the old Testament, to be only a natural Faith, as of Enoch, Moses, Josuah, Rahab, &c. I answer, First, 'Tis very certain that the word Faith, in Scripture, is taken in very diverse acceptations, sometimes for the Profession of the

\* ἱερο  
Xristianis  
Ἰδὲ ὡς μὴ  
ὁρίσται.  
&c. Euseb.  
Eccl. Hist.  
lib. 1. c. 4.  
† Hier. in  
Gal. 2.  
|| Greg. M.  
in Ex. 1.  
Rom. 6.  
\* Cyril.  
contra Ju-  
lian. lib. 1.

the Gospel, sometimes for a belief of Christ's being able to cure Diseases, sometimes for a trust and reliance upon God's promises in general, which are all distinguished from the particular reliance upon God's mercy and Promises through the Merits of Jesus Christ, which is the only true justifying Faith. Now, 'tis true, the Apostle, in the eleventh of the *Hebrews*, where he reckons up all those eminent examples of Faith, does not understand by Faith here, strictly the justifying Faith; but only a firm reliance upon God's promises, that he will, in his good time, deliver his Servants; and therefore he urges these precedents of Faith and trusting in God, to encourage the Christians to a chearful undergoing of their Sufferings, and a perseverance in their Belief, that God will shortly deliver them, by destroying the *Jews*, which were their bitterest Enemies: for in the Verses immediately preceding this Chapter, he comforts his fainting Converts in these words, *Yet a little while; and he that shall come will come, and will not tarry. Now the just shall live by Faith, but if any Man draw back, my Soul shall have no pleasure in him.* By which it is plain, That the Examples that are afterwards brought to confirm those wavering Christians in this sort of Faith or Perseverance in their Sufferings, must be famous for their Perseverance in Afflictions, upon account of this Faith or reliance upon God's promises to deliver them; and that this sort of Faith is that which is chiefly recommended here. But then, Secondly, It no ways follows that these good men, whose examples are here proposed, had no other Faith but this. These, and all other good men under the old Testament, had a formal Faith in the *Messias* or Christ Jesus, which is the true justifying Faith. *Moses* wrote of Christ, *Act. 3. 2, to the end*, as our Saviour tells the *Jews*, that they might believe on him, *Joh. 5. 46. And many Prophets and righteous men have desired to see the things which they saw, Matt. 13. 17. and that many Kings have desired it, Luk. 10. 24. Jacob*, when he was dying said, that he had waited for the Salvation of the Lord, *Gen. 49. 18. Anna* the Prophetess spake of Christ to all them that looked for redemption at Jerusalem, *Luk. 2. 38. Philip* said that he had found him of whom *Moses* in the Law, and the Prophets did write, *Joh. 1. 45. The Samaritan Woman* knew that Christ cometh, *Joh. 4. 25. St. Paul* speaks in his Oration to *Agrippa*, of the Promise made unto the Father, unto which the Twelve Tribes instantly serving God day and night, hope to come, *Act. 26. 6.* From all which it is plain, That all these good Servants of God did believe in Christ the Saviour of the World; and that this Faith of theirs was imputed unto them for Righteousness. And so now what is become of our Authour's natural Faith which he makes to be the Mother of the Evangelical? The Faith of these good

good Men was the gift of God as well as ours, they were justified by Faith, and so are we, *Gal. 3. 8.* they live by Faith in Christ Jesus as well as we, they disclaimed all righteousness in works as well as we; so that if theirs be a natural Faith, ours must be so too. And so now by our Authour's natural Faith, and other Mens moral grace, we are in a fair way to have all Christianity dwindled into downright Paganism.

# CHAP. IV.

*That Credulity is not Faith, but an opposite Vice.*

OUR Authour being resolved to carry on his notion of natural Faith, and to make it a compleat Heathen Virtue, has resolved to bring it to the test of the Heathen Philosophy; and to make it to suit the better with the *Aristotelian* Vertues, has gotten it two extream Vices to surround it, Infidelity in the defect, and Credulity in the excess. But 'tis Credulity is the Vice that our Authour has the pique against; and therefore spends all this Chapter to prove, that Credulity is not Faith. And this we could readily have granted him, without all his pains of proving it. Now one would think, that this was easy enough to prove, and yet he has unluckily failed in the attempt. For instead of proving, that Credulity is not Faith, which is easy enough of all Conscience to do, he first goes to prove, that Credulity is an excess of Faith, as Fool-hardiness is of Valour, or Prodigality of Bounty. And secondly, That they that believe contrary to reason, are guilty of Credulity. Now one would think, that when our Authour had before laid down, that Faith was only Justice to God, he would make Credulity, which he would have the excess of this Justice, to be *summum jus*, and so consequently, to be *summa injuria* towards him; and this he should do, if he kept up to his own Rules, and the analogy of these moral Vertues. But he very fairly lets that alone, and falls again to proving, that which no body will deny; That Men must not believe, in contradiction to their reason, in compliance with any humane Authority. Now for ought that the Authour has gained of his point in this Chapter, he might as well have proved, that a Bear was not a Man, or a Man was not a Mouse; all that ever he could propose to himself, was, to insinuate into his unwary Readers, that our Faith, in the Blessed Trinity, is not Faith but Credulity; and that we are therefore Credulous, because he would suppose

pose we ground that Faith only upon humane Authority, by which means chiefly the Authority of ancient Councils. Therefore what I shall say to this Chapter, I shall reduce to two heads, and shew,

*First*, That Credulity is not excess of divine Faith.

*Secondly*, That an acquiescence in the determinations of General Councils in matter of Faith, is not Credulity.

*First*, That Credulity is not an excess of divine Faith.

Credulity is a Vice by which we easily give our assent to the relation of another, without just reasons and motives for it. Now this Vice in its ordinary notion, is only opposite to that just humane belief that is owing to one another, as we are Men. For humane Faith or Belief of what another Man says, when neither the matter it self, nor the Relater, is liable to any just exception, is a social duty; and which any Man that speaks truth, and has not justly lost his reputation, may claim from us, as Fellow Creatures. But when the matter related is incredible, or which my Reason tells me is not enough probable, or when the Relater is sufficiently exceptionable, or if any thing else accompany the Relation, which will give sufficient suspicion of falsity to a prudent Man; then if I believe such a Relation, I am truly said to be Credulous; because there I make my Belief exceed its just bounds, I give more credit to the Relater than he ought to have: whereas my Faith in this case ought to stop at the confines of probability, I let it pass over them, and believe things improbable. But there can be no such thing in a divine Faith, for taking that in our Author's sense to be only a piece of justice to God, there can be no excess in believing what he reveals or relates to us: 'tis impossible there should be any exception against him as a Relater, for he is most true, and cannot deceive us: as to whatever difficulty there lies in the matter related, he is most powerful, and can make good what he promises; his Wisdom is infinite, and knows exactly the express *Modes* of those Truths he has revealed to us; which our finite understandings cannot comprehend. It is impossible for us to believe too much, what God affirms, unless we could suppose, that our Belief could be greater than God's Veracity, or that God could say something, was so which we knew impossible to be so. So that to make Credulity an excess of Faith, is to prescribe bounds how far Men should believe God, and to give them caution, that they should not credit him any farther than they saw reason for it; but when his Relations began to them to seem unreasonable, that then they should choose whether they would believe him or no, that then they should stand upon their own guard for fear of being censur'd for easy Men, and being thought the worst of all Fools, the Credulous. So that in short, whatever Credulity is, 'tis not an excess



which excess of divine Faith, unless we could believe God too true, or that what God could tell us something was true which was manifestly false.

Secondly, That an acquiescence in the determinations of General Councils, though in matters of Faith, is not Credulity.

I would not have our Authour think, that we ground our Faith in the Blessed Trinity, upon the determinations only of general Councils, which he means by his *greatest humane Authority*, as if we had nothing in Scripture to urge for it; we have Arguments enough from thence to confound all the force and subtilties of our Heretical Adversaries, and several learned Men in the beginning of this Age, have brought so much from thence, as perfectly silenced this Heresy for a time, and has baffled their Cause for ever; I am sure, at least, against all such espousers of it as this Authour seems to be. And as for Councils, when we rely upon their determinations, in asserting and explaining the Ancient Faith, I do not think we are so much credulous, as these sort of Gentlemen are saucy, to say no worse, when they bespatter these August Assemblies, with so much Contumely and Buffoonry as they use to do. There are none of our Church, that look upon the determinations of general Councils, to be the infallible Oracles of God; they are, as our Authour speaks, humane Authorities, but then they are the greatest humane Authority upon Earth, they are the Representatives of the Church Universal; and if our judgments are apt to be inclined by the Authority of single Doctors, they ought to be much more so, by the Authority of such a number of good and learned Men, convened from all the parts of the Christian World. We do not run up the Authority of Councils so high, as to give them power to constitute new Articles of Faith, as the Papists do; but then we look upon them to be the best Judges in the World of old ones, and of what was the true, ancient and Catholick Faith; to declare what Doctrines, according to *\* Livinensis's Rule*, have Universality, Consent, Antiquity, when they come to be contested by Hereticks. For the Members of these Councils being Bishops drawn from all parts of the World, are able to give an account of the Belief of the Faithful, in their Districts, and of the uncorrupted Writings and Traditions of their Fore-fathers. Neither yet do we allow them, if they shall oppose their Opinions or Traditions against the express word of God; but only when they declare the truth of their Doctrine, as *Theodoret* speaks of the *Nicene Fathers*, ἐξ ἡγερῶν καὶ εὐσεβείας ἐνομιμῶν λέγον, out of Scripture words piously understood.

\* Vinc. Livin. contr. Her. Cap.

† Quid unquam aliud Conciliorum decretis enisisset Ecclesia, nisi ut quod antea simpliciter

credebatur hoc idem postea diligentius crederetur? — hoc, inquam, semper, nec quicquam præterea Hereticorum novitatibus excitata Conciliorum suorum decretis Catholica perfecit Ecclesia, ut quod prius à majoribus solâ traditione susceperat, hoc deinde posteris etiam per Scripturæ Chirographum consignaret. Id. cap. 32. || Theod. Hist. Lib. 1. Cap. 8.



of which there is no one but must allow them to be the most excellent and the most authentick Expositors. And yet though we cannot grant it to be an Article of our Christian Faith, That general Councils cannot err, because there is no such proposition found in Scripture, nor by any necessary consequence to be deduced from thence; but most good Men look upon it as a Theological Verity, for which there are some probable Arguments out of Scripture alledged, as *Mat. 18. 20.* *When two or three are gathered together in my name, I will be in the midst of them,* and *Joh. 16. 3.* *When the Spirit of Truth is come, he will guide you into all Truth:* and the most good and learned Men in all times, have generally thought, that the inerrability of a general Council, that was fairly called, and duly celebrated, was one of the *piè credibilia*, which a good Man, though he is not necessitated, is yet well disposed to believe. For if we consider the great love which God does bear to his Church, and the peculiar Providence he does exercise over it; if we consider the promises that he has made to it, that it is his desire, that all Men should be saved, and should come to the knowledge of all necessary Truth; there is no good Man but will be inclined to believe, that God out of his infinite love and goodness, which he has declared to bear to his Church, will not suffer the Representatives of it in these sacred Assemblies, to err in any important matter of Faith; that he will not permit any deadly poison thus to sink into the bowels of his Church, when they use all the fair and honest means they can to avoid it; but that he will give his holy Spirit to direct them in settling the true Faith, as may be best for the edification of his Church.

But though general Councils have not a divine inerrable Authority, yet they have in matters of Religion, the greatest humane and coercive one; especially when owned and confirmed by the secular Power: therefore though we were certain, that they had determined something erroneously, and which our own reason and judgment told us was so; yet we ought to keep this reason to our selves, and not to oppose the concurring judgments of so many great and holy Men, with our private sentiments: 'tis more probable, that we should be deceived than they, and though God might pardon our mistakes when we take care they should go no farther than our selves, yet we cannot be so sure of that, when we endeavour to bring others likewise into our errors. A good Man, though he could not be convinced of the truth of their determinations, yet out of duty and respect to so great an Authority, would not go openly to condemn them; for though he looked upon their determinations not as inerrable Declarations of Faith, yet he would take them for the best expedients of Unity; so that

that if he happened to be mistaken in his Sentiments, which are contrary to their Declarations, and should withal endeavour to corrupt others by diffusing them; this would be to make breaches in the Church, which would be more prejudicial to him than his own error; this might make him guilty, at the same time, of Heresy and Schism too. So that I take an acquiescence in the determinations of general Councils, or any such like humane Authority, to be so far from Creduloufness, that 'tis a great part of prudent Caution and Wariness; and that we should be far the more credulous and conceited Fools, if we could believe, that our private opinion was sufficient to weigh down theirs; or that God would suffer the establishments of these great and holy Men, to be pulled down and destroyed by the propagation of our conceptions.

## CHAP. V.

*Why Faith made a greater Figure under the Gospel, than it did under the Law?*

THE Author spends this long Chapter in shewing, what a greater necessity there was in the Primitive Times of Christianity of a strong Faith, than there is now; which made our Saviour to recommend it then so much to his Disciples. Which he illustrates by the instance of Loyalty; which is but mean and inconsiderable in peaceable times, and not worth a reward from the Prince: but in time of danger, when a Man ventures his Life to serve him, 'tis then a Virtue of a larger extent, and ought to be encouraged by the greatest rewards. He proceeds to shew the particular necessity of Faith at that time. First, From the difficulties which hindred the believing of the Gospel, to the Gentiles who despised the meanness of the Gospel, to the Jews who were prejudiced by the fond opinion they had of their own Law, and by the expectation of a pompous Messiah. Secondly, From the danger which the Gospel brought, in exposing its Professors to Persecutions, &c. Thirdly, Upon account of the Methods of the Gospel, which was to be Preached to the whole Heathen World. These are the extraordinary means, he says, why Faith was so much recommended at that time; the ordinary were, the serviceableness of this Vertue to Religion and Holiness, which do continue still, so that God does not load his Servants with more Faith than is absolutely necessary

cessary to Salvation; for if he should do this, he says, he must do it with reason or without reason; if without reason, that would contradict his Wisdom; if with reason, that can be no other but in order to the piety and happiness of Man. And this is the sum of this Chapter.

Now any one may see what the design of all this is, to make the belief of our Saviour's Divinity, and the Doctrine of the Trinity, to be no part of the Faith delivered to the Saints; and that those great exhortations to Faith the Scripture gives, had no relation to the Faith of our Saviour's Divinity; and that they were not urged to strengthen them against any difficulties they might conceive in this Doctrine, but only to confirm them against those other difficulties and dangers, which he there mentions. Now though 'tis very true, that these difficulties which the Author mentions, were such as did deter many from espousing Christianity; so that there was need of a greater Faith than ordinary at that time to conquer them, yet he does not enumerate all the difficulties their Faith was to superate, but leaves out that principal end of Faith, which was to give life to all the rest, that Jesus Christ was the eternal Son of God. This Doctrine was so strange and wonderful, both to Jews and Gentiles, that it frightened many Protestants away from Christianity; so that how much soever the fondness of the Jews, to their own Law, and the meanness of our Saviour's appearance, might hinder them from complying with his Religion; yet this Doctrine of his, being the Eternal Son of God, and equal with his Father, was such a hard saying, a truth so difficult to mens natural reason at first appearance; that they ought to have had as great encouragement to confirm their Faith in this point, as to support them against any of those difficulties which our Author mentions. And this we find to be the great scandal all along to the Jews. For Joh. 5. when our Saviour declares to them his original, his being the Son of God, and his co-operating with the Father: *My Father worketh hitherto and I work, therefore the Jews sought the more to kill him, because he not only had broken the Sabbath, but said also, that God was his Father, making himself equal with God.* And so Joh. 6. 58. when our Saviour declares himself to be the Bread which came down from Heaven, many of his Disciples when they heard this, said, *This is a hard saying, who can bear it?* And so likewise, v. 52. *What if ye shall see the Son of Man ascend up where he was before?* It follows, that from that time many of his Disciples went back, and walked no more with him. And again, Joh. 8. upon our Saviour's declaring to the Jews, that he was the Son of God, they are all so enraged, as to tell him, *that he is a Samaritan, and hath a Devil,* Joh. 8. 15. And so likewise v. 58. upon his saying,

before

before Abraham was I am, they took up stones to cast at him. The like offence they took at his forgiving sins, *Mat. 9. 11.* nor at any other word or action of his, which did any ways seem to infer his Divinity. So that there was a great deal of need of a very strong and vigorous Faith to believe in the Divinity of Christ at that time, especially when they had so many prejudices to deter them from it. And besides we find, that our Saviour does greatly incourage and commend those, that did heartily believe, and make a ready profession of it. Thus *Mat. 16.* when Peter made that eminent confession of our Saviour's Divinity, *Thou art the Son of the living God*, he immediately gives him his blessing, and entails that great Promise upon him, *Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock will I build my Church, and the gates of Hell shall not prevail against it, Job. 16. 18.* And so *Job. 20. 28.* when Thomas made that most express confession of our Lord's Divinity, upon occasion of his being certified of the Resurrection, *My Lord and my God*, our Saviour gives him blessing, not only to him, but to all those that shall believe this, without being Eye-witnesses of his Resurrection to confirm them in it: *Blessed are they which have not seen, and yet have believed.* And thus we find our Saviour did many of his miraculous Cures in requital of their Faith, and their ready confession of his Divinity, as on the blind Man, *Mat. 20.* that cried out so vehemently, *have mercy on me, O Lord, thou Son of David:* and *Luke 19.* when the blind Man cries out *Jesus thou Son of David:* *have mercy on me*, our Saviour tells him upon his Cure, *thy faith hath saved thee, &c.* \* Where by the Son of David is meant the Messias, who accord- \* *Vid.* ing to the Jewish Doctors was to be God. b So that this Confession of his being the Son of David, was a Confession of his Divinity, which was a great means to incline our Saviour to work their Cure, and to tell one of them that his Faith had saved him. And thus we have let our Author know there was some other use of Faith, at the beginning of the Gospel, than what he mentions; and that there was not only a need of Faith to strengthen them against the dangers, &c. which the Gospel brought on them; but to make them believe in Christ's Divinity, and to profess that most important Article of our Christian Faith. *Mat. 16.* \* supposed in the text. The next thing which the Author in this Chapter would have, is, That Faith in the Gospel has no relation to Christ's Divinity; because, he says, *God like a good Prince, would not treat his good subjects with unnecessary burdens*, but only such as there was reason for, and which were necessary to Piety and a good Life. Now I hope that our Author and his Friends, for all their pretence to reason, will not be so bold with God Almighty, as to give the Rationale

*Chald. Paraph. in Gen. 49. 18. & Targum Hierosol. in loc. eundem, & Phil. de Agr. Lib. 2.*



tionale of all his Commands, and exactly to shew the motives that inclined his Eternal Will, whose Judgments are unsearchable, and his ways past finding out. I confess I have always lookt upon it as a very daring piece of Confidence in these sort of Authours, to say in case of a positive Command, That God has not Commanded such a thing; or, This Command must not be understood in this manner, because there is no reason that he should thus command us: or as our Authour says, 'Tis to dishonour God, to believe him to require Faith for any other reason, than because it is necessary for our encouragement to Holiness; or as he says afterwards, For its serviceableness to the Divine Life. For though we could see no reason for such a Command, yet God may: and 'tis but reasonable as well as modest to think, that God understands the reason of his own Laws best, and that he that gave us these Precepts, best understood the ends for which he designed them. But because the Authour should not triumph too much over us poor dull Trinitarians, or think there is no reason to be given, why Faith in the persons of the Blessed Trinity, should be commanded us; or in particular, that the Belief of the Divinity of our Saviour (which it is our Authour's chief design to impugn, as appears by his following Chapters) least I say he should think, this Belief does contribute nothing to Religion and Piety, let him be pleased to take with him those considerations.

*First*, That to believe the Divinity of our Saviour is necessary to Religion, because by it there is gained a greater Authority to his Laws. For we find that Men are more and more inclined to respect Rules and Laws from the dignity of the person that gives them. The Rules and Injunctions of ordinary persons are usually contemned and slighted, though if the same came from a great and magnificent Person, they would be embraced with a great deal of eagerness and veneration. Therefore in compassion to this infirmity of Mankind, it has pleased the infinite Wisdom and Goodness of God, to let a Person of the Divine Nature, the Son of his Bosom, to take our nature upon him to be himself the propounder of these Heavenly Rules of his holy Gospel, to be himself the Promiser of all those glorious Rewards, which he vouchsafes to propose to those that shall obey his Precepts. Now such a Person as this could be liable to no exceptions, though a Prophet might be mistaken in his Revelation, might outgo or misapply his Credentials; yet when God himself undertakes the Embassy, malice it self can except nothing here; so that this will be proof against the utmost Infidelity.

*Secondly*, This Belief does further Religion because it improves our Love and Gratitude to God upon consideration of so immense a benefit.



benefit. Indeed it had been a great token of God's love to Mankind in any ways to have contrived our Redemption, to have rescued us from that forlorn miserable Estate into which we were fallen; and to have placed us in a Capacity of attaining Everlasting Happiness. But then his love is far greater to us, when he hath sent his only begotten Son to die for our sins, and to purchase our Redemption by such an unvaluable price. And we may take notice, that the Apostles do place the choicest mark of God's love, in choosing such extraordinary means to work Mens Salvation by, as the Incarnation and Death of his own Son. *God so loved the World, that he gave his only begotten Son,* Joh. 3. 16. *God spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all,* Rom. 8. 32. *Herein is love; not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins,* 1 Joh. 4. 10. And truly this consideration, that a Person of the glorious Trinity, one that is God blessed for ever, should for the sake of us wretched Sinners, undergo such an exinanition, as to take our nature upon him, to live a miserable Life, and to die a shameful Death, to reconcile us unto God; this consideration, I say, is of all most apt to work upon generous Minds, to hinder them from offending so good and gracious a God, after such an unparall'd Mercy; and nothing can be so effectual to make Men ashamed of the ingratitude of their Sins, if they have any the least spark of Generosity or Vertue, when they reflect upon this so inexpressible goodness.

Thirdly, Because this Belief does secure us of the remission of our sins, by an assurance we now have of the compleat satisfaction which Christ has made for the sins of all Men. We know our Saviour came into the World, that Repentance and Remission of Sins should be Preached in his Name. Now we are certain, that it is not possible for the blood of Bulls and Goats to take away sin, Heb. 10. 4. and we are as certain, that the blood of meer Man would be as far from doing it as the other; so that we could have no assurance of our Redemption at all, unless we were redeemed by the blood of God, Act. 10. 28. For because our sins had received an infinite aggravation, by being against a God of infinite Dignity, as all offences are increased proportionably as the person offended is of greater worth; and therefore these sins had entailed upon them an infinite punishment; it was impossible that any satisfaction could be made by any thing less than an infinite Person, because none but such an one could pay the infinite price that was due; and he might do it, because the temporary punishment in the infinite dignity of his Person, was a full equivalent to the infinity of punishment which was due to us. So that this belief of our Saviour's Divinity, is necessary to the believing the remission of our sins, and so to be sure is necessary to Piety.

poise we ground that Faith only upon humane Authority, by which means chiefly the Authority of ancient Councils. Therefore what I shall say to this Chapter, I shall reduce to two heads, and shew

*First*, That Credulity is not excess of divine Faith.

*Secondly*, That an acquiescence in the determinations of General Councils in matter of Faith, is not Credulity.

*First*, That Credulity is not an excess of divine Faith.

Credulity is a Vice by which we easily give our assent to the relation of another, without just reasons and motives for it. Now this Vice, in its ordinary notion, is only opposite to that just humane belief that is owing to one another, as we are Men. For humane Faith or Belief of what another Man says, when neither the matter it self, nor the Relater, is liable to any just exception, is a social duty; and which any Man that speaks truth, and has not justly lost his reputation, may claim from us, as Fellow Creatures. But when the matter related is incredible, or which my Reason tells me is not enough probable, or when the Relater is sufficiently exceptionable; or if any thing else accompany the Relation, which will give sufficient suspicion of falsity to a prudent Man; then if I believe such a Relation, I am truly said to be Credulous; because there I make my Belief exceed its just bounds, I give more credit to the Relater than he ought to have; whereas my Faith in this case ought to stop at the confines of probability, I let it pass over them, and believe things improbable. But there can be no such thing in a divine Faith, for taking that in our Author's sense to be only a piece of justice to God, there can be no excess in believing what he reveals or relates to us: 'tis impossible there should be any exception against him as a Relater, for he is most true, and cannot deceive us; as to whatever difficulty there may be in the matter related, he is most powerful, and can make good what he promises; his Wisdom is infinite, and knows exactly the express *Modes* of those Truths he has revealed to us; which our finite understandings cannot comprehend. It is impossible for us to believe too much what God affirms, unless we could suppose, that our Belief could be greater than God's Veracity, or that God could say something was so which we knew impossible to be so. So that to make Credulity an excess of Faith, is to prescribe bounds how far Men should believe God, and to give them caution, that they should not credit him any farther than they saw reason for it; but when his Relations began to them to seem unreasonable, that then they should choose whether they would believe him or no, that then they should stand upon their own guard for fear of being censur'd for easy Men, and being thought the worst of all Fools, the Credulous. So that in short, whatever Credulity is, 'tis not an excess

cross of divine Faith, unless we could believe God too true, or that God could tell us something was true which was manifestly false.

*Secondly*, That an acquiescence in the determinations of General Councils, though in matters of Faith, is not Credulity.

I would not have our Authour think, that we ground our Faith in the Blessed Trinity, upon the determinations only of general Councils, which he means by his *greatest humane Authority*, as if we had nothing in Scripture to urge for it; we have Arguments enough from thence to confound all the force and subtilties of our Heretical Adversaries; and several learned Men in the beginning of this Age, have brought so much from thence, as perfectly silenced this Heresy for a time, and has baffled their Cause for ever; I am sure, at least, against all such opposers of it as this Authour seems to be. And as for Councils, when we rely upon their determinations, in asserting and explaining the Ancient Faith, I do not think we are so much credulous, as these sort of Gentlemen are saucy, to say no worse, when they bespatter these August Assemblies, with so much Contumely and Buffoonry as they use to do. There are none of our Church, that look upon the determinations of general Councils, to be the infallible Oracles of God; they are, as our Authour speaks, humane Authorities; but then they are the greatest humane Authority upon Earth, they are the Representatives of the Church Universal; and if our judgments are apt to be inclined by the Authority of single Doctors, they ought to be much more so, by the Authority of such a number of good and learned Men, convened from all the parts of the Christian World. We do not run up the Authority of Councils so high, as to give them power to constitute new Articles of Faith, as the Papists do; but then we look upon them to be the best Judges in the World of old ones, and of what was the true, ancient and Catholick Faith; to declare what Doctrines, according to \* *Lirinensis*'s Rule, have Universality, Consent, Antiquity, when they come to be contested by Hereticks. † For the Members of these Councils being Bishops drawn from all parts of the World, are able to give an account of the Belief of the Faithful, in their Districts, and of the uncorrupted Writings and Traditions of their Fore-fathers. Neither yet do we allow them, if they shall oppose their Opinions or Traditions against the express word of God; but only when they declare the truth of their Doctrine, as *Theodoret* || speaks of the *Nicene* Fathers, ἡ ἱερωσύνη ἡ ἐκκλησία ἐκ τῶν ἁγίων ὑποτάσσεται αὐτοῖς, out of Scripture words piously understood; ἡ ἱερωσύνη ἡ ἐκκλησία ἐκ τῶν ἁγίων ὑποτάσσεται αὐτοῖς.

\* Vinc. *Lirin. contr. Her. Cap.*

† Quid unquam aliud Conciliorum decretis enisistat? Ecclēsia, nisi ut quod antea simpliciter

credebatur hoc idem postea diligentius crederetur? — hoc, inquam, semper, nec quicquam posterea Hereticorum novitatibus excitata Conciliorum suorum decretis Catholica perfecit. Ecclesia, ut quod prius à majoribus solè traditione susceperat, hoc deinde posteris etiam per Scripturæ Chirographum consignaret.

Id. cap. 32. || *Theod. Hist. Lib. 1. Cap. 8.*

of which there is no one but must allow them to be the most excellent and the most authentick Expositors. And yet though we cannot grant it to be an Article of our Christian Faith, That general Councils cannot err, because there is no such proposition found in Scripture, nor by any necessary consequence to be deduced from thence; but most good Men look upon it as a Theological Verity, for which there are some probable Arguments out of Scripture alledged, as *Mat. 18. 20. When two or three are gathered together in my name, I will be in the midst of them,* and *Joh. 16. 3. When the spirit of Truth is come, he will guide you into all Truth:* and the most good and learned Men in all times, have generally thought, that the inerrability of a general Council, that was fairly called, and duly celebrated, was one of the *piè credibilia*, which a good Man, though he is not necessitated, is yet well disposed to believe. For if we consider the great love which God does bear to his Church, and the peculiar Providence he does exercise over it; if we consider the promises that he has made to it, that it is his desire, that all Men should be saved, and should come to the knowledge of all necessary Truth; there is no good Man but will be inclined to believe, that God out of his infinite love and goodness, which he has declared to bear to his Church, will not suffer the Representatives of it in these sacred Assemblies, to err in any important matter of Faith; that he will not permit any deadly poison thus to sink into the bowels of his Church, when they use all the fair and honest means they can to avoid it; but that he will give his holy Spirit to direct them in settling the true Faith, as may be best for the edification of his Church.

But though general Councils have not a divine inerrable Authority, yet they have in matters of Religion, the greatest humane and coercive one; especially when owned and confirmed by the secular Power: therefore though we were certain, that they had determined something erroneously, and which our own reason and judgment told us was so; yet we ought to keep this reason to our selves, and not to oppose the concurring judgments of so many great and holy Men, with our private sentiments: 'tis more probable, that we should be deceived than they, and though God might pardon our mistakes when we take care they should go no farther than our selves, yet we cannot be so sure of that, when we endeavour to bring others likewise into our errors. A good Man, though he could not be convinced of the truth of their determinations, yet out of duty and respect to so great an Authority, would not go openly to condemn them; for though he looked upon their determinations not as inerrable Declarations of Faith, yet he would take them for the best expedients of Unity; so



that if he happened to be mistaken in his Sentiments, which are contrary to their Declarations, and should withal endeavour to corrupt others by diffusing them; this would be to make breaches in the Church, which would be more prejudicial to him than his own error; this might make him guilty, at the same time, of Heresy and Schism too. So that I take an acquiescence in the determinations of general Councils, or any such like humane Authority, to be so far from Credulousness; that 'tis a great part of prudent Caution and Wariness; and that we should be far the more credulous and conceited Fools, if we could believe, that our private opinion was sufficient to weigh down theirs; or that God would suffer the establishments of these great and holy Men, to be pulled down and destroyed by the propagation of our conceptions.

## CHAP. V.

*Why Faith made a greater Figure under the Gospel, than it did under the Law?*

THE Author spends this long Chapter in shewing, what a greater necessity there was in the Primitive Times of Christianity of a strong Faith, than there is now; which made our Saviour to recommend it then so much to his Disciples. Which he illustrates by the instance of Loyalty; which is but mean and inconsiderable in peaceable times, and not worth a reward from the Prince: but in time of danger, when a Man ventures his Life to serve him, 'tis then a Virtue of a larger extent, and ought to be encouraged by the greatest rewards. He proceeds to shew the particular necessity of Faith at that time. First, From the difficulties which hindred the believing of the Gospel, to the Gentiles who despised the meanness of the Gospel, to the Jews who were prejudiced by the fond opinion they had of their own Law, and by the expectation of a pompous Messiah. Secondly, From the danger which the Gospel brought, in exposing its Professors to Persecutions, &c. Thirdly, Upon account of the Methods of the Gospel, which was to be Preached to the whole Heathen World: These are the extraordinary means, he says, why Faith was so much recommended at that time; the ordinary were, the serviceableness of this Vertue to Religion and Holiness, which do continue still, so that God does not load his Servants with more Faith than is absolutely necessary

cessary to Salvation; for if he should do this, he says, he must do it with reason or without reason; if without reason, that would contradict his Wisdom; if with reason, that can be no other but in order to the piety and happiness of Man. And this is the sum of this Chapter.

Now any one may see what the design of all this is, to make the belief of our Saviour's Divinity, and the Doctrine of the Trinity, to be no part of the Faith delivered to the Saints; and that those great exhortations to Faith the Scripture gives, had no relation to the Faith of our Saviour's Divinity; and that they were not urged to strengthen them against any difficulties they might conceive in this Doctrine, but only to confirm them against those other difficulties and dangers, which he there mentions. Now though 'tis very true, that these difficulties which the Author mentions, were such as did deter many from espousing Christianity; so that there was need of a greater Faith than ordinary at that time to conquer them, yet he does not enumerate all the difficulties their Faith was to surmount, but leaves out that principal end of Faith, which was to give life to all the rest, that Jesus Christ was the eternal Son of God. This Doctrine was so strange and wonderful, both to Jews and Gentiles, that it frightened many Protestants away from Christianity; so that how much soever the fondness of the Jews, to their own Law, and the meanness of our Saviour's appearance, might hinder them from complying with his Religion; yet this Doctrine of his, being the eternal Son of God, and equal with his Father, was such a hard saying, a truth so difficult to mens natural reason at first appearance, that they ought to have had as great encouragement to confirm their Faith in this point, as to support them against any of those difficulties which our Author mentions. And this we find to be the great scandal all along to the Jews. For Joh. 5. when our Saviour declares to them his original, his being the Son of God, and his co-operating with the Father: *My Father worketh his works and I work, therefore the Jews sought the more to kill him, because he not only had broken the Sabbath, but said also, that God was his Father, making himself equal with God.* And so Joh. 6. 58. when our Saviour declares himself to be the Bread which came down from Heaven, many of his Disciples when they heard this, said, *This is a hard saying, who can bear it?* And so likewise, v. 52. *What if ye shall see the Son of Man ascend up where he was before?* It follows, that from that time many of his Disciples went back, and walked no more with him. And again, Joh. 8. upon our Saviour's declaring to the Jews, that he was the Son of God, they are all so enraged, as to tell him, *that he is a Samaritan, and hath a Devil,* Joh. 8. 15. And so likewise v. 58. upon his saying,

before

before Abraham was I am, they took up stones to cast at him. The like offence they took at his forgiving sins, *Mat. 9. 11.* nor at any other word or action of his, which did any ways seem to infer his Divinity. So that there was a great deal of need of a very strong and vigorous Faith to believe in the Divinity of Christ at that time, especially when they had so many prejudices to deter them from it. And besides we find, that our Saviour does greatly encourage and commend those, that did heartily believe, and make a ready profession of it. Thus *Mat. 16.* when Peter made that eminent confession of our Saviour's Divinity, *Thou art the Son of the living God*, he immediately gives him his blessing, and entails that great Promise upon him, *Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock will I build my Church, and the gates of Hell shall not prevail against it.* *Joh. 16. 28.* And so *Joh. 20. 28.* when Thomas made that most express confession of our Lord's Divinity, upon occasion of his being certified of the Resurrection, *My Lord and my God,* our Saviour gives his blessing, not only to him, but to all those that shall believe this, without being Eye-witnesses of his Resurrection to confirm them in it. *Blessed are they which have not seen, and yet have believed.* And thus we find our Saviour did many of his miraculous Cures, in requital of their Faith, and their ready confession of his Divinity, as on the blind Man, *Mat. 20.* *Thou sayest out do vehemently, have mercy on me, O Lord, thou Son of David.* and *Mat. 29.* when the blind Man cries out *Jesus thou Son of David, have mercy on me,* our Saviour tells him upon his Cure, *thy faith hath saved thee.* *Mat. 9. 22.* Where by the Son of David is meant the Messiah, who according to the Jewish Doctors was to be God. So that this Confession of his being the Son of David, was a Confession of his Divinity, which was a great means to incline our Saviour to work their Cure, and to tell one of them that his Faith had saved him. And thus we have let our Author know there was some other use of Faith, at the beginning of the Gospel; than what he mentions; and that there was not only a need of Faith to strengthen them against the dangers, *etc.* which the Gospel brought on them; but to make them believe in Christ's Divinity, and to profess that most important Article of our Christian Faith. *1. Joh. 4. 19.* *Whoso loveth the Father, loveth the Son, which he hath manifested.* The next thing which the Author in this Chapter would have, is, That Faith in the Gospel has no relation to Christ's Divinity; because he says, *God like a good Prince, will not bind his good subjects with unnecessary burdens* but only such as there was reason for, and which were necessary to Piety and a good Life.

Now I hope that our Author and his Friends, for all their pretence to reason, will not be so bold with God Almighty, as to give the Rationale

\* Vid. Chald. Paraph. in Gen. 49. 18. & Targum Hierosol. in loc. eundem, & Phil. de Agr. Lib. 2.

tionale of all his Commands, and exactly to shew the motives that inclined his Eternal Will, whose Judgments are unsearchable, and his ways past finding out. I confess I have always lookt upon it as a very daring piece of Confidence in these sort of Authours, to say in case of a positive Command, That God has not Commanded such a thing; or, This Command must not be understood in this manner, because there is no reason that he should thus command us: or as our Authour says, 'Tis to dishonour God, to believe him to require Faith for any other reason, than because it is necessary for our encouragement to Holiness; or as he says afterwards, For its serviceableness to the Divine Life. For though we could see no reason for such a Command, yet God may: and 'tis but reasonable as well as modest to think, that God understands the reason of his own Laws best, and that he that gave us these Precepts, best understood the ends for which he designed them. But because the Authour should not triumph too much over us poor dull Trinitarians, or think there is no reason to be given, why Faith in the persons of the Blessed Trinity, should be commanded us; or in particular, that the Belief of the Divinity of our Saviour (which it is our Authour's chief design to impugn, as appears by his following Chapters) least I say he should think, this Belief does contribute nothing to Religion and Piety, let him be pleased to take with him these considerations.

*First*, That to believe the Divinity of our Saviour is necessary to Religion, because by it there is gained a greater Authority to his Laws. For we find that Men are more and more inclined to respect Rules and Laws from the dignity of the person that gives them. The Rules and Injunctions of ordinary persons are usually contemned and slighted, though if the same came from a great and magnificent Person, they would be embraced with a great deal of eagerness and veneration. Therefore in compassion to this infirmity of Mankind, it has pleased the infinite Wisdom and Goodness of God, to let a Person of the Divine Nature, the Son of his Bosom, to take our nature upon him, to be himself the propounder of these Heavenly Rules of his holy Gospel, to be himself the Promiser of all those glorious Rewards, which he vouchsafes to propose to those that shall obey his Precepts. Now such a Person as this could be liable to no exceptions, though a Prophet might be mistaken in his Revelation, might outgo or misapply his Credentials; yet when God himself undertakes the Embassage, malice it self can except nothing here; so that this will be proof against the utmost Infidelity.

*Secondly*, This Belief does further Religion because it improves our Love and Gratitude to God upon consideration of so immense a benefit.



benefit. Indeed it had been a great token of God's love to Mankind any ways to have contrived our Redemption, to have rescued us from that forlorn miserable Estate into which we were fallen; and to have placed us in a Capacity of attaining Everlasting Happiness. But then his love is far greater to us, when he hath sent his only begotten Son to die for our sins, and to purchase our Redemption by such an unvaluable price. And we may take notice, that the Apostles do place the choicest mark of God's love, in chusing such extraordinary means to work Mens Salvation by, as the Incarnation and Death of his own Son. *God so loved the World, that he gave his only begotten Son,* Joh. 3. 16. *God spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all,* Rom. 8. 32. *Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins,* 1 Joh. 4. 10. And truly this consideration, that a Person of the glorious Trinity, one that is God blessed for ever, should for the sake of us wretched Sinners, undergo such an exinanition, as to take our nature upon him, to live a miserable Life, and to die a shameful Death, to reconcile us unto God; this consideration, I say, is of all most apt to work upon generous Minds, to hinder them from offending so good and gracious a God, after such an unparallel'd Mercy; and nothing can be so effectual to make Men ashamed of the ingratitude of their Sins, if they have any the least spark of Generosity or Vertue, when they reflect upon this so inexpressible goodness.

*Thirdly,* Because this Belief does secure us of the remission of our sins, by an assurance we now have of the compleat satisfaction which Christ has made for the sins of all Men. We know our Saviour came into the World, that Repentance and Remission of Sins should be Preached in his Name. Now we are certain, that it is not possible for the blood of Bulls and Goats to take away sin, Heb. 10. 4. and we are as certain, that the blood of meer Man would be as far from doing it as the other; so that we could have no assurance of our Redemption at all, unless we were redeemed by the blood of God, Act. 10. 28. For because our sins had received an infinite aggravation, by being against a God of infinite Dignity, as all offences are increased proportionably as the person offended is of greater worth; and therefore these sins had entailed upon them an infinite punishment; it was impossible that any satisfaction could be made by any thing less than an infinite Person, because none but such an one could pay the infinite price that was due; and he might do it, because the temporary punishment in the infinite dignity of his Person, was a full equivalent to the infinity of punishment which was due to us. So that this belief of our Saviour's Divinity, is necessary to the believing the remission of our sins, and so to be sure is necessary to Piety.

## CHAP. VI

*Of Faith in Christ as the Saviour of the World.*

**T**HE Author here divides the Faith of Christ into two objects of Belief. I. The Person in whom we believe. II. The Word in which we believe upon the credit of the Person. In treating of the first of these, he declares, First, What kind of Person our Lord requires us to believe him to be. Secondly, What is meant by believing in him. And when he comes to shew what kind of Person our Saviour declares himself to be, he makes a fine Company of Socinian glosses upon Scripture, which it will be worth our while a little to consider. For whereas he is mightily afraid, that the titles of the Son of God, &c. would be a pregnant proof of our Saviour's Divinity, he is resolved to distinguish them off by a few Polish Criticisms. For first he says, that God in Scripture is used to express something which is indefinite, and which implies more than we can readily express. From whence he would infer, that the Title of *Son of God*, is no Argument for Christ's Divinity; but only that he is some extraordinary remarkable Person. But let us a little examine the Instances he brings. The first is *God do so to me, and more also*. Now can any mortal Man conclude from hence, that the word *God* is used to signify something indefinite? The word *more* does signify something indefinite indeed, but the word *God* signifies no more than it does in other places, and the Author might as well have transcribed all the Texts in the Bible, in which he found the word *God* as this; and they would have been as much to his purpose. I know not what particular Text the Author does refer to for this expression, for 'tis in many; and as far as can be collected, 'twas a form of Cursing in use among the Jews, about the time of *Samuel*, and some time after; for 'tis found only in the Historical Writers of those times, 1 Sam. 3. 17. and 4. 44. and 29. 22. 2 Sam. 3. 9. and 35. 2 Sam. 19. 3. 1 Kings 22. 23. 2 Kings 6. 13. Sometimes by way of adjuration to another, as of old *Eli* to *Samuel*, *God do so to thee, and more also if thou hide any thing from me of all the things that he said unto thee*, 1 Sam. 3. 17. that is, I charge thee to tell me all the threatnings which God tells thee; or else may all, and more than he threatens, light on thee. Other times by way of imprecation of mischief on ones self, as in the case of *Solomon*, 1 King 2. 23. *God do so to me, and more also, if Adonijah have not spoken this against his own life*; i. e. I will for this Crime take away *Adonijah's* Life,

Life, or else may God take away mine, or punish me worse than I intend to punish him. And so in the other places, where the word God has not an indefinite Sense; but there is only a wishing of some Evil or Punishment which is indefinite, greater than the Evil there pointed at, but not expressed of how large a Degree of Greatness.

His *Second Instance* is out of *Joel 4. 12. Because I will do this unto thee, prepare to meet thy God, O Israel.* Now, I don't see what more indefinite signification there is in the word God here, than in other places. Indeed there is the severest denunciation of God's Judgments upon an irreclaimable People, after Famine, Pestilence, Sword, and Fire; so that God tells them, seeing they are proof against all these scourges, he will try what they can do against him, when he personally becomes their Adversary, and see if they are able to cope with him too. *Prepare then to meet thy God, O Israel.* 'Tis not the word God here, that does signify any indefinite number of Evils, but that God does Sarcastically upbraid their Obstinacy, after all his Judgments having been ineffectual upon them, by proposing his infinite Power as a Match for them, if nothing else can be. *Prepare, &c.*

A bitter *Sarcasm*, says the excellent \* Dean of *Paul's*, as if a man could be a match for God; and a poor weak creature he, in any wise, able to encounter him to whom Power belongs. Another Notion the Author has got, Why Christ should be called the Son of God, is, because he is a considerable Person, one of great Note and Eminence; it being the Scripture Idiom, to advance things, by entitling them to God; as the Mountains of God, and the Rivers of God, were those that were most eminent in their kind. It is true, That this sort of Expression is usual in Scripture, to denote something that is great; as the Mountain of God, the Cedar of God, *Nimrod* was a mighty Hunter before the Lord, or a Hunter of God. With great Wrestlings have I wrestled with my Sister, says *Rachel*, or with the Wrestlings of God, *Baptists Elabim, Luthariansihus Dei.* But it does not follow from hence, That our Saviour was called the Son of God, because he was a great Person. By this way of speaking, he might well enough be styled the Man of God, or the Prophet of God, to denote him a great Man, or a great Prophet, but in no propriety of speech the Son of God; for the word Son does not denote the Person but Relation; so that the Son of God is one to whom God does bear the relation of a Father. Therefore it is not his Greatness that entitles him thus to God, but his Filiation; for if it was only his Greatness that entituled him to this Character, the mighty *Nimrod*, or the great Mountain might, upon this account, be called the Sons of God as well as he; because they were great in their kind as well as he.

\* Dr. Tillotson's Ser. vol. 2. Sermon 1.

Well, but, says the Authour, *Daniel* makes the Son of God be a Character of one of great Beauty and Majesty, by calling the Fourth Person in *Nebuchadnezzar's* Furnace by that name. There is no reason to assert, That this Fourth Person here, was the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity: for, as the Authour says, we can't suppose *Nebuchadnezzar* to have seen the Son of God before, and, upon that account, to have known him. All that *Nebuchadnezzar* or *Daniel*, who relates this matter, understood by the Son of God, was an Angel, who from their high Conversation with God, from the great Portion of Happiness and Glory he communicates to them, and their so resembling him by their Purity and the Spiritualness of their Nature, and from their living in Heaven with him, like Children under the wing of their Parent: from these and the like circumstances, they were, and not improperly, called the Sons of God; as we find in many places of Scripture, as *Psal.* 82. *I said ye were Angels, or the Children of the Most High.* So *Job* 1. 6. *There was a day when the Sons of God, or Angels, presented themselves before the Lord.* And the LXX. translate this very place in *Daniel* by *ἡ μορφή τοῦ τέταρτου ὡς τοῦ ἑνὸς ἀγγέλου τοῦ θεοῦ*, the form of the Fourth was like the Angel of God. So that we must grant, That the Son of God, here mentioned, was an Angel of God. But our Blessed Saviour was the Son of God in another manner than his: for his Sonship is not founded upon any such Analogy as theirs is; but upon the eternal generation of the Father; for he being made so much better than the Angels, as he hath by Inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they, *Heb.* 1. 4. In short, 'tis impossible, that our Saviour's Sonship should be such a Sonship as that of the Angels; because the Apostle spends this whole Chapter to prove him a Person distinct from and above the nature of Angels, and does besides set the Son of God in direct opposition to the Angels of God. And of the Angels he saith, *Eccl.* v. 7. But unto the Son he saith, *Eccl.* v. 8. *When he bringeth in his first begotten into the world, he saith, Let all the Angels of God worship him.* So that Christ's Sonship must be of another kind than that of the Angels: or else there would be no ground for their contradistinction, unless he was in a peculiar manner the Son of God, in a supereminent extraordinary way not at all common to them.

The Authour having made these Remarks upon this Title of our Saviour, *The Son of God*: he proceeds to reckon up some others, as the *Messias* or *Christ*, *Only begotten Son of God*; which Characters he allows to speak a Person of immeasurable Greatness, a Person like his Emblem, the Light so glorious, that by our most intent view we cannot discover anything of it, but this, That we cannot discover.

Now for all our Authour's haste, one would imagine that something



thing was discoverable in our Saviour, by these Enologies; that God did design to manifest or discover something to us of him, by these Revelations, and not to make Revelations of things that were not revealable. 'Tis not to be expected indeed, that, by the help of Revelation, we should dive into the Nature of our Saviour's eternal Essence: for we are so far from a possibility of doing that, that we are ignorant of the Essential Constitutions of the most inconsiderable Being we are conversant with. But though we are ignorant of this, yet we can tell, when 'tis revealed to us by God, what kind of Nature our Saviour's is, whether finite or infinite, whether divine or humane. The Gloriousness of his Nature does not so dazzle our Eyes as to make us confound distinct and express Idea's. I have a certain, though not an adequate Idea or Notion of God, as a Being infinite, incorporeal, &c. And when I am informed by Revelation that such a Person is that infinite, incorporeal Being; or that he has, in such Revelation, those Characters ascribed to him, as are inseparable from the Divine Nature; I must conclude, That such a one is a Person of the Divine Nature, such an infinite, incorporeal, &c. Being, which is my Notion of God. Indeed the gloriousness of this Being keeps Men from discovering its Essence, and from prying into its Nature; but yet we may observe such Marks and Properties in it; so as to have a distinct Conception of it, from all other Beings in the World. The Sun is a glorious Body, and the more we strive to pry into its Constitution by gazing on it, the more we are blinded; and what then? don't we know the Sun when we see it for all this? because our Eyes are so weak that we cannot stare into the Furnace of the Sun, must we therefore take it for a Candle? The Person of our Saviour is glorious, and if it were a thousand times less glorious than it is, I might not understand its Nature; but when I am told, that this Person is God, that he is one of the Persons of the Divine Nature, my Understanding tells me very clearly, That all the marks and properties I have in my Mind of the Divine Nature must be attributed to this Person, and though I understand nothing of his Essence, or the precise *modus* of his *Hypostasis*; yet I am sure he is that Being, which I have a certain Idea of, and which I call God. So that 'tis a great Fallacy in the Author to say, we don't know what our Saviour is, because we cannot dive into his Essence: for our discriminative Knowledge of one thing from another, is not by discovering the Essences, or internal Constitutions of them, but by regarding their outward marks and properties; and these every one has a Knowledge of: for a Child knows a Rose from a Stone as well as a Philosopher, though it knows not the Qualities and internal Constitutions of either.

Therefore

Therefore when I am infallibly informed, that such a Person is God, I am infallibly assured he is that kind of Being I have the fore-mentioned Idea of: though I am infinitely short of understanding its Nature.

II. Our Author now comes to shew what is meant by believing in his Person, which he branches into *Two Parts*. *First*, Believing in him with respect to his word. *Second*, In respect to his Person. The *First* of which onely he speaks to in this Chapter, and says that Christ is to his Followers as the Sun to Travellers. 'Tis no matter what they think of its magnitude, or whether they think it be no bigger than a Bushel, it guides them all alike; and thus it is, he says, with the Sun of Righteousness: 'Tis no matter what we believe him to be, if we have but a Practical Faith; which is all our Saviour, he says, requires. And thus he attempts to prove out of *Joh. 10.* a place, than which, one would have thought, he should rather have chosen any Text in the New Testament besides, *How long dost thou make us to doubt, if thou be the Christ tell us plainly? Jesus said, I told you (by calling God my Father) and ye believe me not, Joh. 10. 24, 25.* And presently after he tells them, *I and my Father are one, v. 30.* at which they took up stones to stone him, saying, thou bring a man maketh thy self God. Now, what can the Author draw from this? Why, he says, our Saviour, upon so pressing an occasion as their endeavouring to stone him, did not assert his right of Divinity; but contented himself with this Answer, *Is it not written, in your Law, I have said ye are Gods? If he called them Gods to whom the word of God came, and the Scripture cannot be broken, say ye of him whom the Father hath sanctified and sent into the World, thou blasphemest, because I said I am the Son of God.* Let the Author make out of this place what he can for his Opinion; I am sure this place is as pregnant a proof of our Lord's Divinity, as most places in the Bible are; and whatever the Author thinks, he does exactly Answer to the Jews Question: and tells them plainly, he is what they expected the *Messias* to be, the Son of God, and very God. For *First*, in this place he tells them, *I and my Father are one, v. 30.* We two Persons are the same God: and 'tis plain, That the Jews understood that to be his Meaning, by their great rage which followed, and their Answer to his Question, why they should so barbarously use him, after so many of his kind and saving Miracles. For a good work we stone thee not, but for Blasphemy, and because that thou bring a Man maketh thy self God. And *Secondly*, he gives them a reason why he might claim the title of God, without Blasphemy; whereas *Rulers to whom the word of God came, or who had their Power and Authority from him, are called Gods in Scripture, Psal. 2. 7, & 116.* Why has not he whom the Father hath sanctified, &c. a better claim to this Title? But besides,



for truly theuffling of *Arius*, and the ambiguous terms he used, made the Emperour think 'twas only a Controversie about Words. But however the Emperour looked upon *Arius* to be in the wrong, as appears by what he says in his Letter to him; *And you Arius have inconsiderately asserted (ἀπορροῦτως ἠρξάμενος) what you ought not so much as to have thought of at first, or when you had thought of it, you should have passed it over in silence.* But what, after all, though the Emperour thought 'twas no matter who was in the right, *Arius* or *Alexander*; and though he was of our Authour's Opinion, That a right Belief of our Saviour's Divinity signified nothing? Yet this is but the single opinion of one, who was but a Novice in Christianity; and 'tis most reasonable to think, that *Alexander* and the other Learned Bishops, better understood the Importance of that Question, than the Emperour, whose Arms and other business of the Empire drew his Thoughts another way. But besides, afterwards when *Constantine* was better informed, of the mischievous Consequences of the *Arian* Tenets, he quickly alter'd his Sentiments of their Cause, and did not then treat them with such soft and favourable Expressions. After the conclusion of the *Nicene Council*, in his Epistle to the Church of *Alexandria*, he triumphs mightily that Truth has at last prevailed, and blesses himself at the Thoughts of the *Arian* Blasphemies. || *How great, says he, and how execrable Contumelies, (Good God! be thou propitious and merciful to us) do they irreverently and wickedly cast upon our venerable Saviour, our Hope and our Life; and have not only impudently asserted things contrary to the divinely inspired Scriptures and our holy Faith; but have openly professed, That they believe them too? In this Epistle he calls Arius, impudent Minister of the Devil, avarice, avarice, avarice; and in his other Letter to the Bishops and People, he says, it seems to him requisite, that Arius and his Followers should be called Porphyrians; that they may be known by their Name, whose Manners they follow. And there orders, if any Book be found of Arius's, that it be immediately burned, That not only his Execrable Doctrine may be thoroughly rooted up; but that there may be no Monument left to Posterity.* And now let the Authour make the best he can of *Constantine's* Judgment; and if his other Arguments will support him no better than this, his Cause, I am afraid, will soon come to the ground.

His next Argument is drawn from the similitude of the Sun, That 'tis not necessary the Traveller should understand the Dimensions of that Body, when he goes by its Light; so it is not at all necessary to know what our Saviour is, to practise his Commands. But this Argument I have already answered in the *Fifth Chapter*; when I shewed what Influence the Belief of our Saviour's Divinity had upon Men's Lives.

\* Soc. Eccl.  
Hist. lib. 1.  
cap. 6.

\* Soc. Eccl.  
Hist. lib. 1.  
cap. 6.

But



But his Argument which follows, is very fine and Philosophical. That when he considers the great disproportion between our Earth, and so many Worlds, which he fancies to be from the innumerable Stars we discover with and without the Telescope, each Star being the Sun or the Center of a World, from this consideration he cannot imagine, that our great Creatour should be so greedy of a little of our corrupt breath, as to purchase it with a fall from Heaven. This would be to disgrace our Lord from the dignity of a Benefactor, to the vileness of an unskilful Tradesman; who buys vile wares, and pays for it infinitely more than it is worth. Indeed I have hardly patience to answer this abominable Blasphemy; to see a foolish Philosopher thus horridly to affront his Creatour, and in this witless Buffoonry to ridicule the infinite satisfaction of his blessed Redeemer; because he cannot make it agree with his system of Physicks. But pray let him consider, that we do not think, the dignity of our nature, or the beauty of our World inclined God, who has no respect of persons, to work our Redemption: this was only the effect of his infinite mercy, which we can never enough admire and praise. And besides, what signifies the largeness and gloriousness of the Heavenly Bodies, in comparison with Mens Immortal Souls? The Sun is the most glorious Body we see; and yet a Fly is a more noble Creature than that. The sensitive Soul, that this is endowed with, advances its excellence far above any the most glorious inanimate being, that can be imagined. But the immortal Soul of one Man is of more dignity than all the Corporeal Creation, and if there had been no other way to redeem Mens Souls that were lost, but by the destruction of all the other Creation, 'twould not have been unbecoming the divine Wisdom to have destroyed all them, to have redeemed these; because these are of infinitely more value than they. But it may be that the Authour thinks, there are an infinite number of Worlds, all stocked with rational Creatures, of, it may be, much more dignity than we; so that it was not worth God's while to take care of such insignificant Creatures as we are. Now we know nothing of these great Bodies, and for what use Providence designed them, besides for the benefits we receive from them; and therefore Men talk at random when they ascribe any other to them. But supposing there were rational Creatures in ten Millions of Earths, that were moving round their respective Suns, must God less take care of our World, because he has a great many more to take care of? This is to attribute a foolish weakness to the Deity, and to think it is with him as it is with some Parents, who when they have a great number of Children, do not love any particular Child so well, as if they had but that alone, or but fewer. Certainly God bears a Fatherly Love

to all his Creatures, and will provide whatsoever is necessary for them; 'tis not his providing for innumerable other Creatures, that can hinder him from providing for us: his Omniscience cannot be distracted by innumerable Operations, and his infinite Power and Love can, and will do all things that are necessary for us. So that it be requisite to repair the forfeited Souls of Mankind; that a Person of the Godhead should make an infinite satisfaction, for sins against an infinite Majesty, and which do deserve an infinite punishment; 'tis not the gloriousness of the other Worlds which should hinder him from doing it; for his Fatherly compassion reaches to us as well as them; and he would not stick to use these means for our Redemption, if no other could effect it. But the Author says, that then Christ has paid infinitely more than the ware was worth, like an unskilful Tradesman, as he calls him. I shall not now dispute, whether God could have pardoned the sins of the World, any other way than by the blood of God; 'tis enough for us to know, that God has done it only by these means, and to be sufficiently thankful to him for it. And when the Author, or any of his Party, shall think fit to engage upon a dispute of satisfaction, the Pens of those excellent Defenders of our Religion of late against Popery, will not be silent in this dispute; if they shall think fit to begin it; though all the Tribe down from *Sermon* to this Author, will not be able to shake any part of the Treatises on this subject, by the most Excellent *Grotius*, and the Bishop of *Worcester*. But because the Author here offers nothing but his bare assertion, and because I have in part answered this objection already in the fifth Chapter; I shall proceed to his next Argument, which is, That it is not supposable that our Lord should require a belief in his Divinity, because it was not required of some of the first Embracers of Christianity, such as *Philip's* Eunuch, and the like; who were baptized into the Christian Faith, he says, without any knowledge of his Divinity. It is very certain, we do not find in Scripture any set Form, to be recited by all Persons to be baptized, that declares an express belief in our Saviour's Divinity; but such a Declaration has been the Custom of the Church in the most early times, and therefore though the Scripture do not assert any such Declaration, yet such a silence, especially considering the compendious way of writing in the Authors of these Books, cannot conclude, that there was no such form used by them, or that all that were to be baptized did not give an express assent to, and belief in the Doctrine of the Trinity. It is most certain, they were baptized with a form of words which does imply that Doctrine, viz. *In the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost*. So that unless we will suppose, that they

they were baptized into names which they did not understand, which we cannot suppose any reasonable Men should; they must understand the meaning and purport of these names, and so have a belief in the person as well as in the Doctrine of our Saviour. For how can we suppose; but that when any new Converts to Christianity, should see others baptized before them into these three names of Father, Son and Holy Ghost, they should never trouble themselves to know who they were? If they were Jews, they would by this be afraid of running into the Gentile Polytheism, and would be sure to be well instructed in this matter, for fear of Idolatry. If they were Gentile Converts to hear this form without any farther Instruction, they would be apt to think this was but to keep in their own Religion still, and only to retrench the number of their Gods from 300, to 3; which would be still as much contradiction to the Principles of their Conversion, as their former Tenets. So that we must needs think, that the Apostles did explain this form of Baptism to all that were baptized, how suddenly soever, and did inform them; what these three Persons, into whose names they were baptized were, and how they were consistent with the unity of the Deity, which would give them the full notion of the Doctrine of the Trinity. And though all that is recorded of the belief of this Eunuch is; that he believed that *Jesus Christ is the Son of God*, yet it is to be supposed, that he believed in God the Father too, or else *Philip* would not have baptized him; and 'tis also very reasonable to think, that he that was so inquisitive about the sense of the Prophecies, would not be less exact in endeavouring to understand the meaning of this strange form of his Baptism, a Ceremony which was of so grand import. But we find in later times, when History and Relations are more distinct, that persons to be baptized were to recite their Creed, into which they were thoroughly instructed before by a full explanation of all its Articles; and if in case of extream danger, they were like to die before they were sufficiently instructed, \* though \* 37, 38 they were then baptized, yet they were obliged to be sufficiently instructed afterwards, if they recovered. They were also particularly obliged to give their assent in Baptism to each single person of the Trinity †, upon each of the three immersions. Now this trine immer-

veritas, et doctrina et alia ad easdem immersiones rite rite, et yoyodo xon tri dnas d-  
pilas: rasis d-  
Conc. Laod. Can. 47. Cyril. Catech. Ambrosi de Sacram. Lib. 2. Cap. 7. † Non  
finitis sed et ad singula nomina in personas singulas tingimur; Tertul. adv. Praxeam, cap. 26. Bap-  
tismus res ad quantitates immersionem, interrogat articulos fidei, confessi sunt, viz. Se credere in verum  
Deum Patrem omnipotentem; se credere in Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum et carnem ejus: se  
credere in spiritum sanctum. Ambrosi de Sacram. Lib. 2. Cap. 7.

\* *Multa sunt quæ per traditionem in Ecclesiis observantur, velut in lavacro ter mergitur.* Hier. adv. Lucifer. *Ter mergimur ut Trinitatis unum appareat Sacramentum.* Id. in cap. 4. Eph. 2. This custom of the trine merſion ſeems to be very ancient in the Church, if not Apoſtolic. 'Twas a Cuſtom before the writing of the Apoſtolic Conſtitutions, which depoſe any Biſhop or Prieſt that ſhall Baptize without it. *Can. Apoſt. Can. 49.* And the Authour under the name of the *Areopagite* mentions the *ἱεὶς καὶ ἀνὴρ* & *ἀνδρῶν.* Dionys. *Areop. Hierarchy. Eccl. Cap. 1. p. 2. p. 217.* And *Eunomius* an Anti-Trinitarian Heretick was the firſt that dared to alter this cuſtom, and bring in the ſingle immerſion. *See Lib. 6. Cap. 26.* And it continued in the Church generally till about the year 600, when the Orthodox in Spain began to diſuſe it, becauſe the Hereticks had taken it up. *Vid. Greg. Magn. Ep. ad Leandr. Ep. Hiſp. & Concil. Tolet. Can. 5.* † *Conſuetudo apud nos iſtiusmodi eſt, ut his qui baptizandi ſunt per quadraginta dies publice tradamus ſanctam & adorandam Trinitatem.* Hier. ad Pamach. adv. cr. Joh. Hieroſol.

† *Auguſt. Socini Reſp. ad Jac. Wickam.*

ſion, in token of the Faith in the Trinity \*, *St. Jerom* ſays, was obſerved by ancient Tradition in the Church, and that they were thrice immerged, *that there might appear one Sacrament of the three Perſons.* Nay the ſame † *Father* tells us farther in another place, that 'twas a Cuſtom in the Church, for the forty days before Baptiſm, that in the days of *Lent*, (they being baptized at *Eaſter*) the Perſons to be baptized, ſhould be thoroughly inſtructed in the Doctrine of the Trinity. So that whereas it was the uſe of the Church, in the moſt early times, to inſtruct Perſons to be baptized in the Doctrine of the Trinity, and this Cuſtom was deliver'd down to them by Tradition, and it being not to be ſuppoſed, but that Men of ſenſe would enquire, of their own accord, into the meaning of the form of their Baptiſm, which would lead them into the knowledge of this Doctrine; for to be baptized into the name of any one, is to be baptized into the belief and worſhip of him, ſo that this does neceſſarily inform them of three Perſons to be believed in, and worſhipped, which three Perſons they are ſure can be but one God; therefore theſe primitive Proſelytes were inſtructed in the Myſtery of the Trinity.

The next Argument the Authour urges, is from a place in *Juſtin Martyr*, in whole days the Authour acknowledges the Doctrine of our Saviours Divinity to be the Doctrine moſt received; but becauſe *Juſtin* ſays in a very ſoft expreſſion, *there are ſome my Friends among us, who profeſs him to be Chriſt, and affirm him to be Man born of Man;* therefore they that did believe ſo were reckoned true Believers. I know not but that the Authour was helped to this Argument by *Faustus Socinus* †, who brings this Authority of *Juſtin* to prove, that many in that Age held Chriſt only to be meer Man. But however; if by Unbelievers the Authour means perfect Infidels, that did not own the Doctrine of Jeſus Chriſt, or that he was ſent of God; but looked on him as a downright Impoſter; I do not think that thoſe perſons *Juſtin* ſpeaks of were ſuch, or were reputed ſuch in the Church at that time: yet though they were not reckoned Unbelievers in that ſenſe, they



they were reckoned false Believers, or Heterodox; they were probably *Ebionites*, or some such Hereticks, that looked upon Christ as meer Man, or else an Angel incarnate, or something of that nature: and though they were reputed Christians, it was never as Orthodox ones; though they might be thought to be in a state of Salvation, yet they were always lookt upon to be in very gross Errors. But it does not follow, that their Opinions were harmless, because *Justin* calls them Friends, he undoubtedly had Friends among the Heathens as well as the Hereticks; and I suppose our Authour would take it very ill, if all Orthodox Christians should commence Enemies to him for his Opinions in this Book. So that the good nature and charitableness of this good Man, could no more palliate the guilt of these Mens wicked Heresies, than their Blasphemies could lessen his Vertues.

The Authour afterwards begins to be very gay and florid, and says, that the Orthodox belief of our Saviour's Divinity, which he pretends to be contrary to that of the Ancients, is *like Diamonds, costly, hard, and useles*, that our Saviours being brought into Questions of this nature, *is like Gold being made into a Pin*, which is only to debase his dignity, *and to employ it at Boys-play*. But who ever said, that our Lord's name, being in any Proposition, gave truth or dignity to it purely as such? Our Authour may be as merry with his Push-pin simile, as he pleases, but I think there is as little sense in this Declamatory stuff, as there is (to use his expression) *of that noble Metal in the point of his Pin*. But though the Question of our Saviour's Divinity does not receive its importance, by having our Saviour's name in it, yet it may from the Command of God, who has obliged us to believe aright in this point; it may from the conducibleness of such a belief to a good Life, as we have proved before, and then all these fine similes are not to much purpose.

But our Authour as he began this Chapter with the Testimony of an Emperour, he ends it with one of a Lord; though perhaps he had plaid the Orator better, if he had given out his least Testimony first, and have begun with the Lord and ended with the Emperour. Though this Testimony I believe will stand him in no more stead than the former, as upon examination will appear. Now this Testimony is of one *Leonas* a Courtier in *Constantinus's* Court, who was sent by that Emperour to preside in the Council of *Seleucia*, who seeing the Bishops fierce and endless (he says) *at this push-pin Doctrine of our Lord's Divinity*, dismissed them with this reprimand, *Go and play the Fools at home*. The Authour quotes *Socrates* for this, though these words are not in him: there are indeed these words, \* ἀνάθεμα ᾧ ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ \* *Socr. Hist. Eccl. Lib.* Get you gone, and play the Fool again in the Church, or in Church

Church matters. But I cannot imagine why the Authour should translate it as he does, unless perhaps he has met with some latin translation of *Socrates*, or some latin Authour, that quoted this place out of him, which led him into this error. And this in all probability is the true case. He finds *ἀνίστασε*, translated by *abire domum*, or *ire domum*, and so thinks the word [*domum*] belongs to the latter part of the Sentence; not to [*abire*], but to [*nugas agite*] the translation of *παύσαίτε*, and so renders it into English, *play the Fool at home*. But whether this be the case or no, it is no great matter, the Testimony is not very considerable; and besides, it does not make any thing against the Orthodox Believers. *Leonas* himself, was in all probability an *Arian*, as being such a Favourite of *Constantius*, and being sent to preside in that Council which did mostly consist of *Arians*: and if any plaid the Fool in this Council 'twas the *Arians*; for the two quarrelling Parties here were both *Arian*, both agreed against the *imbeciles*, in the *Nicene Creed*: the Opinion of the *Acacian Party* we may see at large in *Socrates* \*, in their Creed which they set forth, when they met again at *Constantinople*, *An. 364.* and the other Party † subscribed the Creed, set out by the Council of *Antioch*, which was *Arian* too. So that *Leonas* might well think them to play the Fools, when they were both agreed upon the point, and were very unanimous, as to the main of their Heresy, that they should wrangle, and squabble, and fall to Loggerheads about nothing. For all their bustle was, whether they should express their *Arian* Notions, by altering an old Creed to their purpose, or by framing a new one.

\* *Socr. Lib.*  
2. *Cap. 32.*  
† *Id. Cap.*  
31.

## CHAP. VIII.

*A belief, with respect to the Person of Christ, fruitless towards the Inquirers own satisfaction.*

THE Authour begins this Chapter with a Testimony from the Emperour *Constantine* again, who, in his \* Letter to *Arim* and *Alexander*, says, that the Question they were disputing about was so abstruse, that they could make few among the Multitude to understand it. And what then? the matter of *Alexander's* Belief might be plain enough, and yet they, by their disputes might render it abstruse and puzzling. I have known ordinary Questions in Logic and Morality drawn into such fine Threads by Argumentation, that both the Disputants have lost the sight of the Question, and have hardly at last understood

\* *Euseb. de*  
*vitâ Const.*  
*Lib. 2.*

understood their own meaning. And this might be the Case of *Arius* and *Alexander*, for ought I know. But the Reason why the Emperour thought the Question it self so puzzling, was, because he could see little difference between their Opinions; for he could not so well understand their distinction of a *Generation* and a *Production out of nothing*, he thought this was only a Metaphysical notion too transcendent for vulgar Brains, but was not aware of the Consequence which *Arius* drew from the Son's being produced out of Nothing, that this must make him a *voluntus*, or Creature.

Then he proceeds to shew, That the *Messias* was a Person of whom the Scripture did foretel that his Generation should not be known. But he does not produce any of these Prophecies, and therefore I shall not be obliged to answer those; which some others have brought to our Authour's purpose. All that he brings is a Text out of *John*, and another out of the *Hebrews*; the first is, *we know whence this man is, but when Christ cometh no man knoweth whence he is*, Joh. 7. 27. This place does not prove, That Christ is not the eternal Son of the Father; nay, it rather makes for it than against it; because, by the Phrase, *no man knoweth*, it supposes a Generation above all humane understanding. But it no ways proves, That we cannot tell whether Christ be the Son of God or no; and this it must prove, if it will do the Authour any kindness. All that this Text proves, is, That the *Jews* thought, that Christ was to be of no earthly Extraction, not the Son of any Man, but of God. But we know, say they, whence this Man is, that he is born of *Joseph* and *Mary*; this is the Carpenter's Son, and therefore he cannot be the *Messias*, who is to be of a heavenly original, the Son of God in a manner we cannot tell: for if it was not to be known whether the *Messias* were to be the Son of God or no, why does our Saviour call himself so, and require others to believe him such? and if he was the Son of God, then it was to be known whence he was, in this Sense; so that all that can be drawn from this Text, is, That Christ is not of an earthly Original; and this we would have granted him, without his pains of proving it. The other Text is out of *Heb. 7.* where *Melchizedeck* being brought as a Type of our Saviour, and being there declared to be *ἀντὶς τοῦ πατρὸς*, *ἡ ἀντὶς τοῦ μητρὸς*, without Father, and without Mother, without Descent, therefore Christ's original is not known. Indeed Christ is *ἀντὶς τοῦ πατρὸς*, without Mother, in respect of his Divinity; but he is not without Father, unless that we suppose him falsely to call God his Father, in so many places. But neither was *Melchizedeck* without Father, and without Mother, as not being of an earthly extraction; he was without Father, without Mother, without descent, in relation to the *Aaronical* Priests,

Priests, whose Fathers, and Mothers, and all their Pedigree was exactly set down and preserved in the Jewish Records; but there was no *constat* of *Melchizedeck's* Pedigree; the Scripture is perfectly silent of his Original, and no other Records give an account of it. But our Saviour's Original, according to the flesh, is set down by the *Evangelists*, an exact Catalogue given us of all his Progenitors: therefore *Melchizedeck* is no Type of our Saviour, in this respect. His being like unto the Son of God (as the *Apostle* speaks) in his abiding a Priest continually, v. 3. that is, being of that blessing kind of Priesthood, which shall always continue, when the other of the *Jews* shall be abolished. Well, but the Authour says, That the *Evangelists* derive Christ's Pedigree from a wrong Father, and two different ways, on purpose to amuse us. This is a bold stroke, to tax these inspired Writers with Error and Deceit, and to make the Holy Spirit of God the Spirit of Delusion. But what though the *Evangelists* do shew Christ's descent two different ways, they may be both true for all that; the intermingled Marriages of Families, in our modern manner, where all nigh degrees are prohibited, do often occasion one Person to descend from another two ways, which must be much more so among the *Jews*, who were often to marry their nearest Relations to keep up their Families. Therefore 'tis no wonder if the *Evangelists* relate this Pedigree divers ways, where as it might have been related several other ways and all true: for 'twere easie to draw his present Majesties descent only from *William* the Conquerour, in it may be seven or eight different Branches. But if any one has a mind to see the difficulties of this Genealogy explained, he may see it at large in those excellent Men \* *Grotius* and † *Bochartus*; for it would be too long to enter upon a Discourse of this nature here. So that 'tis a most impudent Falsity in the Authour to say, That it is left impossible to prove our Saviour deriv'd from David, when the *Evangelists* have written these Genealogies for that end.

Next the Authour quarrels with the Bishop of *Alexandria*, for offering to explain the Doctrine of Christ's Divinity; or, as he speaks, for boldly answering, *I will declare his generation*. We know not at this distance, what this Explication of that Bishop was; *Socrates* tells us, that \* he acted the Divine something Philosophically, and with a desire of Honour concerning the Trinity, asserting an Unity in Trinity. But this had been done often before *Alexander's* time; *Tertullian* had wrote a Book of it against *Praxeas*, and we may see as curious Disquisitions, probably as this was, of our Saviour's Divinity, in many of the Fathers before *Alexander*: nay, the Authour allows the Doctrine of our Sa-

\* *Grot. An-*  
*not. in Luk.*

† *Sam. Bo-*  
*charti Pha-*  
*leg.*

\* *Φιλοσο-*  
*φικός*  
*αὐτῆς α-*  
*γίας τε*  
*δὲ ἐν*  
*τελείᾳ*  
*μονάδᾳ*  
*καὶ ἐν*  
*τρίᾳ ὁμο*  
*ούσιᾳ*

*Soer. lib. 1. cap. 3.*



viour's Divinity to be mostly received in *Justin Martyr's* time. Therefore we cannot suppose that it was this curious Disquisition of *Alexander* that so offended *Arius*; for if so, he might as well be offended with *Tertullian* and several others. But *Theodoret* gives us the true state of the Case, \* "*Arius* was nettled at *Alexander's* Advance to the Bishoprick, but could not vent his spleen against him by any Accusation of him, though he watched him narrowly, by reason of the excellent Circumspectness of his Life, and therefore took this Opportunity to cavil at his Doctrine, only for saying, *The Son is of equal honour with the Father, and of the same substance.* This *Arius* had the confidence to contradict in the Face of the Congregation, and to say, what was never said before, (says *Sozomen*) † *That the Son was produced out of nothing, That there was a time when he was not.* So that let *Alexander* be as wary in his Expressions as he could, 'tis ten to one but some time or other he had been caught up by *Arius*, who only waited for an opportunity to oppose him; and probably it would have been indifferent to him, to have broached any other Heresie, if he could, with any plausibility, have contradicted *Alexander*. But notwithstanding this Insolence of *Arius* in the midst of the Congregation, and his endeavouring to gain Profelytes to his Opinion, by disputes open and private; notwithstanding all this Boldness, his Bishop *Alexander* desires only that he would come to a fair Dispute, to try the Truth of his Doctrine: and there was a dispute held, in which the Bishop supplied the Moderator's part very calmly (as the Historian says) \* encouraging each side as they deserved commendation; but in the end of the dispute he determined it against *Arius*, and forthwith commands him to renounce his Error, which he and his Followers pertinaciously refusing, he at last excommunicates them. And truly I think the Bishop had patience enough to suffer so long the Pride and Heresie of this haughty Presbyter; and I cannot but admire his Clemency, in allowing him a Conference before Excommunication, after so impudent an Assault to his Diocesan: and one would be apt to think, that when the Authour blames *Alexander* so much for this action, he had some little Foresight of his own Case. Then followed the great Council of *Nice*, which excommunicated *Arius*, and those Bishops which would not subscribe to its Determinations in this Point; and truly the Authour is so civil to let this Council pass over without reflection, but runs off again to the Bishop of *Alexandria*, whom he censures for his Disobedience to the Imperial Letters for the restoring of *Arius*, upon account of his being excommunicated by the Council, and his wanting the word *in* in his Confession. But 'tis not the same Bishop of *Alexandria* now as was before, which the Authour's Words do imply; for *Alex-*

\* *Theod. lib. 1. cap. 14.*

† *Soz. lib. 1. cap. 14.*

† *Theod. lib. 1. cap. 2.*

\* *τὴν ἀπὸ τῆς φύσεως, τὴν ἀπὸ τῆς οὐσίας, ἰσότητος, ὡς τὸν υἱόν.* *Soz. lib. 1. cap. 14.*

\* Theod.  
lib. 1. cap.  
26.

ander, whom he was so fierce against before, was dead, the living but  
\* five Months after the *Nicene* Council, and *Arhanasius* was chosen  
Bishop in his room, to the great grief of the *Arians*. Neither was  
this excellent Person, whom all the *Arian* Party strove to load with  
the most heavy Accusations, and which the Author would make guilty  
of great disobedience, any ways to be blamed in the matter of re-  
storing *Arius*.

† Soc. lib.  
1. cap. 15.

Before this matter happened, *Eusebius* of *Nicomedia*, and *Theognis*,  
two famous *Arian* Bishops, that had been deposed by the Council and  
banished by the Emperour, were restored, upon their exhibiting a  
fraudulent and dissembling Libel to the Emperour, in which † they  
pretend to be sorry for what they had done, to consent to the word  
*homoiois*, and promise to live peaceably for the future, without any  
further contradiction; and add, that they do not this, to be freed  
from their Banishment, but only because they would not be thought  
to be guilty of Error: but as soon as ever they were restored, they  
made very little of all these Promises, but were as violent in propa-  
gating their *Arianism* as ever; and as *Socrates* says, || abusing the Fa-  
vour that was granted them, raised a greater Tumult in the World than  
they had before. \* They labour earnestly to get *Arius* restored, espe-  
cially *Eusebius*, who deals with an *Arian* Priest, who was Chaplain  
(or *household*) to *Constantia* the Sister of *Constantine*, to use his In-  
terest for his Restoration: This Priest makes the Lady believe, that  
*Arius's* Opinions were not such as were reported, but she does not  
dare to tell the Emperour so much; but the Emperour visiting her oft  
in her Sickness, she recommends this Priest to him for his Piety and  
Loyalty. This Priest having thus gained an Interest in the Emperour,  
he tells him what he had done to *Constantia* before; and besides that  
*Arius* would willingly subscribe to the Decrees of the *Nicene* Coun-  
cil. Upon this relation the Emperour declares, That if this be true,  
† if he join with the Council, and be of their Opinion, that he will  
not only suffer him to approach his Presence, but will send him back  
honourably to *Alexandria*. Upon which, the Emperour writes to *Ari-  
us*, to wait on him at *Constantinople*; which accordingly he does, with  
his Friend *Euzoius*, who was in the same Circumstances; and, upon  
the demand of the Emperour, they jointly give him in a Summ of their  
Belief, which is to be seen in the Historians, cunningly enough word-  
ed, it seems, to impose upon the Emperour; which Creed, *Sozomen*  
says, did *Constantinople* look both ways, might be either Orthodox  
or *Arian*, as 'twas interpreted. Upon this the Emperour is willing  
they should be restored; || but did not think fitting to do it of himself,

|| Socr. lib.  
1. cap. 18.

\* Id. cap.  
18.

† ὁ σωσί-  
θιστος τῶ  
Σωτῆρος  
καὶ σωτήρ  
ἡμῶν.  
Socr. lib.

|| ὁ σωσί-  
θιστος τῶ  
Σωτῆρος  
καὶ σωτήρ  
ἡμῶν.

Soz. lib. 2. cap. 20.

misere.

without the Judgment and approbation of those who are the proper Deciders of this matter according to the Law of the Church. And therefore he writes to the Synod of Bishops which were then congregated at Jerusalem, to take the matter into their consideration, and to inspect their Creed, which he sent with them to the Synod. But this Synod consisting mostly of Eusebius's Creatures; \* for most of the Orthodox \* Baron. Annal. An. 335. Soc. Party had retired after the Solemnity of the Dedication of the Temple was over; they that were diligent Favourers of Arius [*ταῦτα αὐτοὶ* *ἔλαβον*] taking an Opportunity [*καὶ οὕτως λαβόμενοι*] took off his Excommunication. Upon this the same Faction in the Council writ a Synodical Epistle † to the Church of Alexandria, the Bishops and † Athan. de Syn. Soc. ib. Clergy of Egypt, Thibais and Libya to receive Arius and Euzoius with willing Minds as being restored, they say, by so great a Synod; and they write another to the Emperour, to give him an account of what was done, and to desire him to see them actually restored. Arius then comes to Alexandria; but Athanasius, who understood all the Fraudulence of the proceeding, looking on him still as excommunicate, || avoided him as an execrable Person, and would not restore him. Then Arius strives, by infusing his Heresie into the People of the City, to raise a Tumult; thereby to attain his end that way, but this not succeeding, Eusebius procures a Letter from the Emperour, to command him to it. This Athanasius civilly answers; and informs him, That Arius being anathematized by a general Council, he cannot be restored by him again. This very much inflames the Emperour, not well understanding the merits of the Cause, and occasions an angry Letter from him, in which he threatens his deposing him from his Bishoprick, upon refusal. This Opportunity Eusebius gladly improves, and suborns one \* *Ischyran*, a rascally Fellow that had usurped the Priesthood without Ordination in the Diocess of Athanasius, but being detected by him, flies to Eusebius in Nicomedia, who receives him as a Priest, and promises him a Bishoprick if he would accuse Athanasius, which having done he did afterwards procure him. Then were trumped up the Forgeries of the broken Chalice, and the cutting off Arsenius's Hand, and using it for Magick, &c. which were the subject of the Debates of the Arian Council at Tyre, and have, of late, made such a noise in our Socinian Pamphlets. Now in all this, here is no real Disobedience at all of the Bishop to the Emperour, as the Authour would pretend; for the Emperour will not have him restored, unless he be of the opinion of the Nicene Council; and besides, he does not think it a Point in which he ought to meddle, but leaves it to the Council, which he thought Orthodox when it was mostly Arian. But Athanasius finds that Arius's Creed was drawn up so ambiguously

biguously, that any one might see he designed nothing but shuffling; the word *homoousios*, which was the Test of *Arianism*, was left out, and *Arius* still as fond of his Doctrines as ever; and moreover, that the Council which pretended to restore him, was but Provincial at best, and most of the Orthodox in it retired, and the *Eusebian* Party taking off his Excommunication by a trick, and therefore thinks, he may very well, upon these considerations, refuse to restore him, notwithstanding the Imperial Letters. And truly he, or any other Bishop, that would take into his Flock such a Wolf as this upon these terms, would little deserve the name of a good Pastour; and he that should refuse to do so, might justify himself from disobedience to any Earthly Authority whatsoever. He that will see more of *Athanasius's* Vindication, may see it in his own Apologies. I have been more full in the Vindication of this good Man, because the scurrillous Pens, of late, have made it their business, after so many hundred years, to calumniate him again.

The next thing that the Authour offers, is against the word *Consubstantial*, and this from a saying of *Socrates*, *Lib. 1. Cap. 18.* (not Book the 2. as he quotes it) in which the Authour would have him to condemn the word *homoousios*, as a word which did trouble Mens Minds, and which the Bishops themselves did not understand. Now *Socrates* is Friend enough to the Orthodox Cause, every one knows, which makes the Authour brand him with the name of partial, and in many places shews, he had no dislike to the word *Consubstantial*: but he has one fault which is common to many Historians, that he makes too many remarks upon his Relations, and oftentimes in matters, the true reason of which we was far from understanding. But 'tis no great matter what the Historians remarks are, 'tis their Relations, and not their reflections which we are to value; and yet after all, *Socrates* does not in the least reflect upon the Orthodox Doctrine, or the test of it, the *homoousios*. He shews his dislike indeed to those that made too nice explications of it, *περὶ ἧς καὶ λατρεύμενοι καὶ ἀκρίβως λόγούμενοι*, those that crumbled this question into many little Cavils, and raised upon it some nice disputes, and therefore they that did so were to blame; but they might believe what was signified by the word *homoousios*, without any of these Cavils, and they might without any of these Niceties stand up for the word, as being thought, by the wisdom of the Council, to be the best Test to discover the *Arian* Heresy.

Then the Authour applauds himself mightily, in fancying that the Doctrine of the Trinity is not the same now, as it was in *Athanasius's* time; because he in his Dialogues explains this Mystery by the similitude of three Men, who are one in their common nature, and three



three in their individual Capacity; this the Authour would have to infer a Tritheism, and as well to justify the Heathen Polytheism as the Trinity. Now these Dialogues, though bound up with *Athanasius's* Works, are not his; but according to the Opinion of most learned Men, are *Maximus's*: but however, there is nothing in them which would infer any thing like that which the Authour pretends to. He and several other of the Fathers, give many Illustrations, to explain, as far as possible, to humane understandings, this Mystery; but yet they, as all other similitudes, must not be strained farther than the Authours designed them; 'tis enough if they bear that Analogy or likeness which are there singled out, not that these should have, in their whole nature, an uniform similitude. Now *Peter*, *James* and *John*, three Individual Men, and yet agreeing in one common nature Man, are a very good illustration of the Blessed Trinity; for as *Peter* is Man, *James* is Man, and *John* is Man, and yet there is but one Man (that is) one common nature of humanity; so the Father is God, the Son God, and the Holy Ghost God, and yet there is but one God, that is, one common Divine Nature; but yet this illustration does not bear an universal Analogy with the Trinity; for *Peter*, *James* and *John*, agree only in the same common collective nature, and are only collectively one, but Father, Son and Holy Ghost, are essentially one. So that I say, this illustration of the Trinity, may be very good, though it does not hold universally: 'tis enough if the three Persons in each agree in a general Unity, though they differ in the specification of this Unity; 'tis enough if both are three and yet one, though one be by a collective, and the other an essential Oneness. So Bishop, Priest, and Deacon, agree in one common Office of Ministry in general, and this is brought by the same Father, as a farther illustration of this Mystery: and so may any other three Species of a Genus, or any three Individuums of a Species; but then they must be carried no further than it was meant this illustration should go; for to expect an universal similitude, is rather to expect a sameness than a likeness. And now if Men should take the boldness to rack, and tenter, and sport themselves with the Similes and Parables in the New Testament, of our Saviour's Church, Doctrines, Kingdom and the like, as our late *Socinian* Pamphlets have done these of the ancient Fathers, I dare say they might, with as great ease, ridicule the whole Christian Religion, as they do this Doctrine of the Trinity.

As to what the Authour says of the word Mystery, which he calls an impregnable Fort, and the Papists Cock-Argument for Transubstantiation, and his saying, the contradictions are no less in Transubstantiation than the Trinity; this is all bold and impudent Assertion, without

without proof, and therefore requires no Answer: but if any one has a mind to see all these Objections for ever silenced, let him read the two incomparable Dialogues printed in the time of the late Popish Controversy, and Entituled, *the Doctrine of the Trinity and Transubstantiation compared*. Well, but the Authour says, if the Trinity be a Mystery, why should we dispute any longer about it? To dispute concerning a Mystery (says he) and at the same time acknowledge it a Mystery, is a contradiction, as great as any in the greatest Mystery. I see our Authour is all for contradictions, and will have no Mystery without them. I thought a Mystery had been an unintelligible Truth, and not a contradictory falsity. But however, why should we not dispute concerning a Mystery? If the Mysterious Truth be denied, it is to be defended as well as other truths: it is not the less a Truth because it is mysterious, any more than a Conclusion in *Algebra* is not true because I do not understand it. But besides, such a truth has more reason to be contended for, as it is of greater importance, and such we have proved this Doctrine of the holy Trinity to be. Indeed if Men did dispute about a Mystery as a Mystery, there would be something in the Authour's Objection; for then Men would pretend to understand something by their Disputes, whose name imported it was not to be understood. But there is no such thing in the Arguments of the Orthodox, for the defence of the Trinity: they do not dispute this Doctrine as a Mystery, but as a Truth, which in some measure may be understood; they do not dispute about the *modus* of the Trinity, which is unintelligible, but about the existence of it, which is a Truth can be understood; they do not pretend to shew how they are Three in One, but that they are Three in One. There is a vast difference between understanding how things are, and that they are; for a Man may understand there is such an Art as *Algebra*, by seeing *Oughtred*, or *Diophantus*, and yet understand nothing of the way of Reduction of Equation, nor one tittle of the Rules of that Art.

But still the Authour will have this Doctrine a Mystery in his sense, that is, a falsity full of contradictions, from the contrary determinations of Councils, and the various expositions of others, and by the wavering, as he calls it, of the Council of *Sirmium*, which changed their Opinion, and would have called in the Copies of one of their Creeds. As to the contrary determinations of Councils, that to the grief of the Christian Church is but too true, if we may call the *Arian* Synods by that name; for the *Arian* Heresy, by God's Permission, did so much prevail, that by the Countenance of an *Arian* Emperour, the World almost became *Arian*; and then 'twas an easy matter for the Bishops of that persuasion to form themselves into Assemblies, and

to declare what ever Orthodox Opinions they pleased for Heresy. The Anthour, if he had said any thing to his purpose, should have proved, that the determinations of Orthodox Councils, had been contrary one to another, but what are the contradictions of the Hereticks to them. Truth can be but one and the same, though error may be infinite; and therefore the Conformity of the Orthodox Doctrines to one another, shew their verity, whilst the disagreement and clashing of the Heretical Creeds, are an infallible proof of their falsity. The Orthodox always very fairly stick to their old Test, the word *substantia*, but the Hereticks are soon for *substantia*, and soon for *hypostasis*, and sometimes for neither. Well; but the Council of *Sirmium* has contradicted it self. 'Tis very true, and 'tis the misfortune of many Heretical Opiniators to do the same. But by the way, I am afraid the *Arian* Cause has but a very poor Patron of this Anthour; for when ever he has a mind to charge any slip or misdemeanour upon a Council, he always singles out an *Arian* one for it. He lately blamed the *Arian* Council at *Seleucia* for Tumult, and now he charges one of the same Stamp at *Sirmium* for Contradictions. Now the matter at *Sirmium* stands thus.

The *Arian* Heresy about the year 357. had gotten large footing in the World, and they began now to disdain the name of a Sect or \**Epiphan.* Heresy, and to affect the name of Catholics; and to this end would Her. 37. congregate in Councils, not only to defend their own particular Tenets, but also to condemn Heresies. And upon this account 'twas, † *Anban.* that they met at *Sirmium* in the foresaid year, to condemn the Heresy Lib. de Syn. of the *Photinians*, who following *Sabellius* and *Samosatenus*, would have Christ to have no being before the Conception of the Blessed Virgin. This Heresy therefore they condemn, and frame a Creed in opposition to it, where are these words], *Those that shall say, that the Son was* † *Socr. Lib.* *from a no-being before, and from another substance, and not from God, or* 2. Cap. 25. *that there was a time when he was not, those the holy and the Catholick Church, doth esteem Aliens from her, and accursed.* And this Creed, *Socrates* lays, was drawn up by *Marcon Archibishop*, who was a notorious *Arian*. Now these words 'tis true were very pat against the *Photinians*, and served to excellent good purpose for the condemnation of this Heresy: But when they came to renew their quarrel against the Orthodox, they found too late, that they had in a manner given up their cause; for here, at one dash, they had confounded all that *Arian* had been contending with his Bishop *Alexander*, about Christ's being *eternally*, from a no being, and that there was a time when he was not; which though it served to silence *Photinianism*, yet it totally would ruin the Cause of the *Arians*. Therefore they set themselves to work anew

to

to frame another Creed; that might be more *Arian*, which they publish in Latin, in which every thing relating to the *is in*, &c. is left out, and in which they declare, they are ignorant what our Saviour is, and bring as a proof of this, that Text of *Isai. 53. Who shall declare his generation?* But then, upon second thoughts, lest the People should laugh at their Inconstancy, they themselves revoke this second Creed, and strive to get in all the Copies of it, and procure an Edict from the Emperour, which threatens all those that shall detain them. Now indeed we may see here a very foolish inconstancy in these Hereticks, and that they had a very ill hand at making Creeds, to oblige all the World, under the pain of an *Anathema*, to believe such a thing at one time, and the next day to disbelieve it themselves; but this is nothing to the Orthodox Faith, which stood always firm and unchangeable.

After the Authour has been spitting his Venom against the union of the three Persons, he now begins to do the same against the union of Christ's Divinity, with his humanity. For he would have, that upon supposition there are three persons in the same Individual nature, that either the *Nestorian*, or the *Eurychian* Doctrine was the true. For, says he, there are but two ways imaginable in reason: either Christ must be two Persons, because he has two such different natures; or he must have but one nature, because he is but one Person. But for all our Authours haſt, why can't we imagine a third way, that he should be two Natures, and but one Person? This is as easy to imagine, and I am sure as reasonable too. For first, It does not follow, that because he has two Natures, he must be two Persons, for Nature and Personality, are not reciprocal terms, for there may be two or three, or more Natures, where there is but one Person. The *Athanasian* Creed most excellently expresses this, *As the reasonable Soul and flesh is one Man, so God and Man is one Christ.* There is the sensitive nature in Man as well as the rational, there is the rational Soul, one distinct substance united to the Body, another distinct substance; and yet these two so distinct Natures, are but one Person. Now what more contradiction does it imply, that there should be a Personal Union between Divinity and Humanity, than there does between Rationality and Sensibility? If there be any more difficulty in one than the other, it is this, That in the former, the union of the Divinity, with the Humanity, there is an union of two reasonable Natures, which are distinct Persons of themselves as all rational Individuals are; and therefore they must be as distinct Persons after the union as before? But why so? If they are united they are not distinct, for all union is a negation of distinction or division. Two single pieces, or pounds of

Gold,



Gold are two distinct Substances or Bodies, but if these be united by melting down into one, they are still two pounds, but yet they are but one Individual Body. And so it is in the Union of all other Bodies. Well, but what is this to the Union of Spirits, or rational Beings? Yet it is something; for if Spirits be united, they must follow the Laws of Union as well as other Beings. If they be united, they must be one in something, for to be one in nothing is no Union at all. Now in the Union of the Divinity with the humanity, wherein possibly can their Oneness consist, but only in their personality? Their Natures are most certainly distinct, for Gods is one Nature, and Mans is another; and therefore if they be one in any thing, it must be in their Personality. Upon this Union they acquire an Oneness, which they had not before; and as the two distinct pounds of Gold, upon their melting become one Individual piece, which is the Oneness they gain; so the Divinity and Humanity upon their Union, gain one Individual Personality, which is the Oneness they acquire. Well, but here are two rational Natures united, which must have two Reasons and two Wills, and therefore must be two Persons. It does not therefore follow, that because there are two Reasons and two Wills, there must therefore be two Persons; any more than it follows, that a Man is three living Creatures, from the Union of the Vegetative, the Sensitive and the Rational Soul in his nature. For as the Subordination of these Souls one to another, make him but one *Vivens*, so the Subordination of these rational Natures, one to the other, make them but one Person, or rational *Suppositum*. The Divine Nature is indeed the *ὑποκείμενον*, or governing Principle in the Union of the Godhead with the Humanity, as the rational Soul is in the Union with the two other Souls; and therefore though there are two Reasons, and two Wills, yet those of the Inferiour Nature are subordinate to the Superiour, and therefore are determined by the operations of that.

Nor, *Secondly*, is it necessary that if he be one Person, he should be but one Nature; because Nature and Person are not reciprocal terms; and because, as we have already shewn, that more Natures may be united into one Person: for 'twas the Person of the Godhead that took upon him the Humanity, so that he has no other Personality than what he had from all eternity; but yet he has another Nature than what he had from all eternity: because he likewise took upon him our Nature, which he had not from eternity, but took it upon him at that time, when he was conceived in the Womb of the Blessed Virgin. Though he still continued one Person, yet he had two Natures, the Nature of God, which he had from all eternity; and the Nature of Man, which he assumed at that particular time; and this

this without any change, but only in the manner of his subsisting, which was before in the pure Glory of the Son of God, and afterwards in the habit of our Flesh. All the Properties of each Nature, are as distinguishable now, as before, the Properties of the Humanity are incommunicable to the Divinity, and those of the Divinity to the Humanity. 'Tis proper only to the Divinity to be the cause of all things, to be immense, eternal, omnipresent, &c. and 'tis proper only to the Humanity to have a beginning, to be circumscribed in place, to be passible, &c. If, therefore, they have these distinct and incommunicable Properties, they must have distinct Natures, from which these Properties flow, though they be united into one Person. And thus I think I have answered every thing that is material in this Chapter, and I could very willingly have done with it, but only because it may be expected I should say something to those invidious Remarks he makes upon some of the first holy Councils, for the Determinations they made in matters of Faith, and the condemnation of Hereticks. As to what he says about the Heresie of *Nestorius*, 'tis not worth considering; but he has a little too grossly represented the matter of *Eutyches*, which must not pass over without a little Reflection. He would insinuate, that *Eutyches* was first condemned by a Provincial Council, and restored by a General one, which is false. The Council indeed at *Constantinople* — which condemned *Eutyches*, was but Provincial, convened by *Flavianus* Bishop of that place, but it did consist of Orthodox Members, and their Determinations were very free; wherein *Eutyches* had a fair hearing, to answer every thing he would, that was objected against him by *Eusebius* Bishop of *Dorylaeum*, his Accuser, who, before the meeting of this Council, did kindly endeavour to reclaim him; but when nothing would do, he impeaches him in a \* Letter to *Flavianus*, who cites him to the Council; but he resolutely, at first, there avows his Heresie, That Christ had but one Nature after the Union; and, at last, when he began something to abate of his Stiffness, he would by no means recant his Opinion: therefore the Council, who, after several Sessions, could get nothing from him but shuffling; *nemine contradicente*, condemn him; to which Condemnation not only the present Bishops subscribe, but 23 of the *Archimandrian* Clergy that were there. But this so General a Council, as the Author calls it, which restored *Eutyches*, was that, which, for its goodness, has been all along entituled *Λοιμὸν*, the Thievish Council; or the Synod of Robbers, that packt Conventicle at *Ephesus*, which was obtained by this means. *Eutyches*, vext at his Condemnation by the Council, flies to *Dioscorus* Bishop of *Alexandria*, and of *Eutyches*'s Opinion, and persuades him to espouse his Quarrel:

\* Liber.  
Brev. cap.  
11.  
Niceph. lib.  
24.  
Añ. 1.  
Conc. Chalced.

Quarrel: He readily complies, and forthwith procures him an Interest in the Eunuch *Chrysaphius*, President of the Palace, that was a late Profelyte to the *Eutycheian* Heresie, and was very angry with *Flavianus*, for his procedure in the late Council at *Constantinople*; so he, by his own, and the Interest of the Emperess *Eudocia*, obtains of the Emperour *Theodosius*, that there might be a Council held at *Ephesus*; upon pretence, to give *Eutycheus* a fairer Tryal, but in reality to be revenged on *Flavianus*, and to establish *Eutycheianism*. *Dioscorus* gets to be President of this Council, and brings with him a great number of *Egyptian* Bishops of his Opinion: and obtains an \* order from the Emperour, That none that were Judges of *Eutycheus* before should be so now, in this Council; that though they were present, yet they should not vote as Judges, but only expect the Suffrages of the other Fathers; because this was to be a Judgment passed upon what they had judged before. What followed after this practising may easily be imagined: the Faith of *Eutycheus* is approved, and *Eusebius* and *Flavianus* are condemned: But yet it was not easy neither to get the Subscriptions of the Bishops to this, till they were frightened to it by the Arms and Threats of the Souldiers: † and after all, they set their names only † *Evag.* to Blank Paper, to which the Abdication of those Bishops was afterwards annexed. For thus some of the Bishops complain afterwards in 4-  
the Council of *Chalcedon*. || We subscribed only to the pure paper, with *Con. Chalced. Act. 1.* compulsion and violence, having suffered many ill treatments, we did unwillingly, and forced by power, set our hands. They kept us even till night shut up in the Church, and being sick they would not suffer us to rest, nor would grant us any refreshments; but the Souldiers, with Swords and Staves, stood over us, and made us subscribe. The Authour indeed grants, that *Dioscorus* was accused in the Council of *Chalcedon* of some Uncanonical Proceedings, and in truth they were Uncanonical with a Vengeance. For besides all this underhand dealing, and tumultuous proceeding in the Synod, he was accused of no less than the Murder of *Flavianus*; to whom he gave a \* kick in the Synod, upon which he died three \* *Evag.* days after; that he had † contrived the Death of *Theodosius*, and used *Lib. 2. Cap. 2.* several other illegal proceedings against him, only because he was the Friend of *Cyril* his Predecessour; of no less than notorious Incontinency, of keeping Company with one *Pansophia*, an infamous Woman, and according to the information of *Sophronius*, of downright Adultery; of † Blasphemy against the Trinity; of being an *Origenist*; || *B.* of usurping the Imperial Authority; and if all these Crimes can be wiped off with so soft a word as Uncanonical Proceedings, I know not what things in the World those are, which Men call Lewdness and Villainy; unless Hereticks, by a special Title, can claim an immunity

† Zon. in  
Marcian.

munity from these names, where they are guilty of the Crimes. This Council in which these things were made out against *Dioscorus*, the Authour says was procured by *Leo*, because his Letters were slighted in the last, though *Zonaras*† tells us, that *Leo*, and *Anatolius* Bishop of *Constantinople*, intreated this Council of the Emperour, *least the blasphemous Opinions of Eutyches should be left uncondemned*. This Council the Authour does endeavour to render vain and tumultuous, by crying out, This is the Faith of the Fathers, Apostles, &c. *Leo* believes so, *Cyri*l believes so. Now I think it a very laudable occasion for Christian Mens exultation, when their Faith is defended against the poison of Hereticks; for to be still and unconcerned upon such an occasion, would shew they had little love or regard for the Faith they profess. But the reason why they used *Leo* and *Cyri*l's name so expressly, was, because of their excellent Explications of Faith, which were publicly read in the Council, and universally approved; and such Defenders of Orthodoxy do in all Ages deserve as great commendation. But the Authour would pretend the Council did not understand their own meaning, when they propounded the Question, whether they would agree with *Dioscorus*, who said Christ consisted of two, or with *Leo*, who said there were two Natures in Christ; which Question the Authour says is a Mystery, and was designed only to advance the dignity of the Roman Sec. But yet this is no very great Mystery to any one that considers *Dioscorus*, or *Eutyches*'s Doctrine, who held indeed but one nature in Christ, but yet in compliance with the Orthodox, would say Christ consisted of two natures. They would allow Christ at first to be compounded [*conmixtus*] of two natures, but then upon the Union or Composition, they ceased to be two; but the Orthodox held, There were two distinct natures after Union, which did both retain their distinct properties without confusion. So that there is a great deal of difference between saying, Christ does consist of two natures, and, There are two natures in Christ; for the first does suppose them two only before Union, the latter two before and after. But the reason why *Leo* is put in opposition to *Dioscorus*, is to confront that Heretick with a sound Orthodox Believer, and to do an Honour to *Leo* for taking such pains, to defend the true Faith, which *Dioscorus* had used so much Artifice to destroy. Well, but the Emperour *Basiliscus* did not own this Council, but sent Circulatory Letters to burn its Decrees. This is very true, and several other *Eutychians*, as well as *Basiliscus*, had as little kindness for it. But what disgrace is it to this Council to be Condemned by an Heretick and an Usurper, as *Basiliscus* was both? For he had drove his Master, the Emperour *Zeno*, from his Throne, and had embraced



embraced *Eutychianism*, by the Instigation of his Wife *Zenobia*. But the Authour need not lay any great stress upon *Basiliscus's* Circulatory Letters; for within a little time after (his Usurpation continuing but two years, after which *Zeno* was restored) he sends other Circulatory Letters to Countermand the former, and to condemn *Eutyches* and his Followers; and whats most pleasant is, he entitles them in the front the \* *contrary Circulatory Letters* of *Basiliscus*. Now this sickle temper of the Usurper, the Heretical Clergy, that had subscribed his first Circulatory Letters, were much afraid of, which made them desire him to send no other contrary to them, for fear the World should be over-run by Sedition, the Council of Chalcedon having occasioned infinite blood-shed: which expression the Authour would make advantage of against that Council, though it comes to nothing at all. For what can we suppose those Men to say or do, which out of base compliance to a wicked Emperour, had denied their Faith? To be sure they would do all they could to keep up his present resolution; for if he should alter it, and encourage again the Orthodox, they knew very well what a condition they would then be in, after so scandalous a condescension. To hear these Men rail against the Council of Chalcedon, would signify as much, as to hear one of our Clergy, that had read the Declaration in the late Reign, to exclaim against the Sanguinary Laws of the Nation, and the Spirit of Persecution in the Church; which no one to be sure would believe any thing the more for their saying so; because every one must expect they would have something to say, to justify so infamous a compliance.

\* *Ἀντι-  
βασι-  
λεὺς* Ba-  
siliscus.  
Evag. Lib.  
3. Cap. 7.

As to what the Authour mentions farther about the dispute of the two Wills in Christ, this was in no ways owing to the Orthodox Doctrine of the Trinity, but altogether to the Innovations of the Heretics. The Authour gives us some short account of the rise of this Heresy, but neither so fair nor so clear as he ought; for as for the name *Catholics* he mentions, I cannot imagine whom he should mean, unless *Athanasius* the Patriarch of the *Jacobites*, who is the Person, I suppose, he must aim at, though I cannot find he was ever called by that name; indeed he pretended to be a Catholick, and \* *Baronius* in the Margin of his Annals, when he relates something of this matter, writes in large Letters, *Athanasius simulat se Catholicum*, and perhaps this might lead him into this Error. But in short, the rise of † *Mon-*

\* *Baron.  
Annal. An.  
629.*

† So called as some would have it (*Niceph.*) from *Jacobus* the Syrian a great *Eutychian*, or for that they pretended to be converted by *James* the Apostle. Before the Council of Chalcedon, they belonged to the Patriarch of *Antioch*; but afterwards they set up a distinct Patriarch of their own, schismatically professing the Doctrine of *Eutyches*. Their Name has remained long since in the Greek Church, having changed their Opinions, as appears by the Confession of the *Jacobites*.

*scholasticism,*

thelism, which was only a spawn of the Eutybian Heresie, was this, as *Pantus Diaconus* informs us. When the Emperour, that is *Heraclius*, was at *Hierapolis*, *Athanasius* (the Authour's Catholicus) Patriarch of the *Jacobites*, a subtil Man and of a shrewd Wit, coming to the Emperour, and talking of Religious Matters; *Heraclius* perceiving his Parts, promises him he should be Patriarch of *Antioch*, if he would subscribe to the Council of *Chalcedon*, That there were two Natures in Christ. He, greedy of the Prey, pretends to subscribe; but then, to beguile the Emperour, he subtilly subjoins, But what think you of the Wills and Operation in Christ? are there Two Wills, and Two kinds of Operations, or but One? The Emperour, not understanding these Subtilties, sends to *Sergius Bishop* of *Constantinople*, and *Cyrus Bishop* of *Phaselis*; who, as they were of a corrupt Judgment (that is Eutybians) answer, That he had but one Will. In this manner the Emperour being entangled, he desires to draw others into his Opinion. This was the Rise of *Monothelism*, which is no ways owing to the Doctrine of the Orthodox, it being only a Corollary of the Eutybian Heresie; and was propagated only by those that were poisoned with *Eutyber's* Tenets. What the Opinions of these Hereticks particularly were, is no great matter; or what was determined for them in some little by-Synods of their own packing; it is enough to know, that the Catholick Church condemned this Heresie, as soon as it began to gain Footing in the World, by a General Council, the Second of *Constantinople*.

## CHAP. IX.

*It is dangerous.*

AND when the Authour comes to shew this, he is for a home charge at first onset, and makes this danger we incur, by the Orthodox Belief of our Saviour's Divinity, to be no less than *chapel of Blasphemy*. This is a hard Accusation; but the best on't is, 'tis difficult to prove; and the Authour is so civil, as far as I can see, not to attempt it. He has in this Paragraph a Quotation out of *Sacculus*, not much to the purpose, and a little talk about Precipices, and Children's walking upon the top of high and narrow Walls, but not a tittle of the Blasphemy business; unless this be something, when he says, That this Doctrine makes us have so mean an opinion of our Lord's Person as to think it comprehensible. But, by the Authour's Favour, who ever, of the Orthodox, said, our Lord's Person was comprehensible,

hensible, or ever pretended to comprehend it? He was just now charging us for flying to the word Mystery, as an impregnable Fort in this Doctrine; and now he is angry because he fancies we don't think it enough mysterious. This is a pleasant way of arguing the Authour has got, to talk thus backwards and forwards, and within a Page or two; so that I am sure if the Authour cannot believe, he can write Mysteries. But why must every explication of the Possibility of the existence of a thing make it comprehensible? Indeed every thing that is explained, is so far comprehensible as it is explained, and so may any thing that is infinite be so far comprehensible. I can comprehend the possibility of an infinite division of Quantity, but yet I cannot comprehend the *modus* of such a Division farther than the numbers guide me, which I have a perfect notion of. I can comprehend the necessity of God's being eternal, tho' 'tis impossible I should have an adequate Idea of his particular duration, or of that infinite time he has already been, or is to be. That our Saviour is God, is all the Orthodox pretend to comprehend, but not the manner of his being God. They endeavour to make this Truth as intelligible as they can, which the Hereticks would make both false and unintelligible.

2. The Second Danger of this our Belief, he would have to be, because, he says, *We have no firm ground to go upon.* As for Scripture, he says, the Arians cap Texts with the Orthodox; Antiquity they claim'd with equal Confidence; and Councils determin'd sometimes on one side and sometimes on the other, according as Emperours influenc'd them; so that the only Advantage of the Catholicks, is, long Prescription and that after Sentence. Now this is all bold Assertion without one word of Proof; and I hope the Authour does not expect his Reader should take his word for it all. But what though they did cap Scripture? they might do it just as the Authour does, nothing at all to the Purpose: their confident Claim to Antiquity does not give them any just Title to it: neither does our Authour's saying the Councils determin'd according to the Influence of Emperours, any ways prove they did so. When he can prove that the *Arian* Arguments from Scripture, were as good as the Orthodox; That the *Arian* Belief was Apostolical; That the Four first Councils were Conventicles pack'd of Emperour's Creatures; then he will say somewhat: but till then he had better hold his Tongue, than to talk thus impiously against the Catholick Faith, and so irreverently against these August Assemblies; and yet offer nothing at last but impudent Assertion. For there is nothing of these Three things made out, or so much as pretended to be so; but instead of making out these Charges, he falls a giving a History again, after his manner, of the Controversie of the Orthodox with the

*Arians,*

*Arians*, with a few of his Heretical Remarks upon it. He says, *This Controversie was decided first by the great Council of Nice*, and this every body will allow, the Authority of which Council has ever been esteemed equal to Scripture, even by those who in other things reneg its Authority; which by the way is more than most will allow. Well; but he says the Authority of this Council is to be waved rather in this Point, than in any thing else it did. But why so? One would have thought that their Authority had been most significant in this point, especially because they were called together to settle it. Now certainly this must be some very great Reason, which must invalidate the Authority of this Council, even in this Matter above all the rest. And truly the Authour has brought a notable one; one of his own I dare say: for no Mortal Man, I believe, ever thought on't before. This is a Reason which he draws from a Saying of an *Arian* Council that of *Antioch*, which he says confirmed the Decrees of the Council, of *Nice*, which Saying was this: *We do not follow Arius, but receive him when he cometh to us; for how can it be said, that we that are Bishops, follow Arius, who is a Presbyter?* I believe the Reader does not see the Reason yet. But 'tis the Authour's Gloss upon it, which makes it one. If this have any sense (says he) it must be of as good force at *Nice*, as at *Antioch*; and thereby we may judge of the Sentence which first determined the Controversie; not by the Merit of the Cause, but by the Interest of the Parties.

Now suppose we should say this Saying of the Bishops in this Council has no sense at all, then I am afraid our Author's reason has none at all neither. Nay, I will undertake to make out that there is no sense at all in this Saying, or one that is as good as none at all to our Authour's purpose. But to shew how this Case stands, and how fairly he has represented the Matter, I will give a short Account of this Council, and of the occasion of this Expression. There was a Design, that this Council should be called in another place, in the Western Parts, but this the *Eusebian* Party \* would not agree to, as not being willing to have a Council where no Count should be present, no Guards at the Door, and where all things should not be done according to the Prescript of *Cesar*; and therefore feign some foolish Excuses that they cannot come to it, by reason of the *Persian* War, &c. upon which occasion *Athanasius*, in this Epistle, wittily asks the Question, *What have Bishops to do with the War?* Afterwards they get an Opportunity to meet at *Antioch*, A. Dom. 341. in which Synod there were Bishops, according to *Sozomen* †, who reckons almost ninety seven, and only thirty six profess'd *Arians*. But then he does not reckon the *Eusebians*, who were *Arians* in their Judgments, and would, by their

\* *Athanasius ad Solitar.*

† *Soz. Lib. 3. Cap. 5.*



their Practice upon all occasions, declare it, though they would often protest against the Name, as appears in many Instances, and most particularly by their Actions in this Council. Besides, 'tis evident enough that the Majority of this Council were of the same Heretical Stamp, by their chusing *Georgius* to be Bishop of *Alexandria*, in the place of *Athanasius*, who was a notorious *Arian*, and, as *Athanasius* says \*, *hardly a Christian, but only for his advantage*. This Council resolving to establish *Arianism*, though they carefully avoid the Name, as being too odious; they preface their Confession of Faith with this Sentence, which the Authour alledges. Now what sense is there generally in Mens Excuses, when they are resolved to do an ill thing, and want something to say for the doing of it? Here the Synod is resolved to make an *Arian* Confession of Faith, but yet they will not own 'tis *Arian*; though 'tis plain enough 'tis such, by the Tenour of it; which we may see at large in *Socrates* †. Upon this account they can't say, They do not follow that Doctrine which *Arian* professes; but that they do not follow *Arius*, or the Doctrine for *Arius's* sake, as being Men of a greater Character themselves in the Church than *Arius*, they being Bishops, and he but a Presbyter: which, at best, is but a simple Evasion, to make their Heretical Confession, among unwary People, to go down the better. But what is this idle Excuse of an *Arian* Conventicle to the great Orthodox Council of *Nice*? Though they were so vain, as to value their Determinations upon the Interest of Parties, this does not found the *Nicene* Decrees upon this Bottom; though the *Arian* Faith was established upon pure selling of Noses, yet the Orthodox might be grounded upon Scripture and Antiquity: and till the Authour makes it otherways appear, we shall presume to take it for granted.

The Progress of this Controverſie, the Authour ſays, was of the piece; from *Athanasius's* refusing to restore *Arius* upon his Submission; so that the Controverſie was transplanted from Bishop against Presbyter, to Ecclesiastick against Secular Authority. But the main of this Matter we have consider'd in the last Chapter. But one thing the Authour adds more than he said before, which is, That *Athanasius's* pretences, in this Matter, were mere Evasion; because many, who had subscribed to the Council of *Nice*, seconded the Emperour against *Athanasius*, and condemned him in the Council of *Tyre*. Now 'tis very true, that many Bishops subscribed to *Athanasius's* Condemnation, who had before subscribed to the Decrees of *Nice*: but they did not do this out of point of Justice, to secure the Emperour against the pretended Contempt of *Athanasius*, as the Authour would have it, but chiefly to be revenged of such an Adversary. For every one



when *Julius* saw that this second Letter prevailed no more with the Greek Bishops than the other he had sent before, which they answered only, as the Historian speaks, by a Letter full of Ironies; he relates the whole matter to the Emperour *Constans*, who writes to his Brother *Constantinus*, that he might send some Bishops to *Rome*, to answer for the Abdication of *Athanasius* and *Paulus*. And to this end Three are sent, \* *Narcissus* Bishop of *Irenopolis*, *Theodorus* of *Heraclea*, and *Marons* of *Arethusa*. But these being found shuffling in giving an account of their Faith, and to have delivered in a Form of Belief, contrary to the *Nicene*. *Constans* easily perceived that they had persecuted *Athanasius* and *Paulus*, not for any Fault, but only for the matter of their Belief; and therefore sends them back as they came. Notwithstanding all the Intreaties of *Constans* to his Brother, *Athanasius* and *Paulus* could not yet recover their Sees, and therefore they desire of the Emperour *Constans* that a Council may be called, and accordingly there is one called to meet at *Sardica* in *Illyrium*. The † Western Bishops meet, as appointed, at *Sardica* but the Greeks meet at *Philopopolis* in *Thrace*; and from thence write to the Western Bishops that they drive the Excommunicates, *Athanasius* and *Paulus*, from the Council, or otherwise they will not come thither. But at last, to *Sardica* they come, but then they resolutely protest (*ισχυρίζονται*) that they will not enter into the Church, in which those Persons they had excommunicated were. To this the Western Bishops answer, by Letter, That they never avoided Communion with them, neither would they do it; especially since *Julius* the Roman Bishop had diligently inspected their Cause, and had not condemned them; and besides, That they came thither to justify themselves, and to answer the Accusations brought against them. So, at length, nothing coming of this Epistolatory Dispute; the Eastern Bishops being chiefly *Arrian*, will not associate with the Western on these terms, and therefore are resolved to act separately. These Bishops being, in all, but Seventy six, according to *Sozomen*, put on a Conciliar Authority, and the First thing they do, is to excommunicate the Bishop of *Rome*, and *Hosius*, &c. for communicating with the Abdicates. They are nevertheless invited to the Council, by a Letter wrote by † *Hosius*, but they still refuse to come; therefore the Fathers, in the Council, without them, proceed to the Examination of the Crimes objected against *Athanasius*; which having considered, they pronounce him innocent; and send their Letters into *Egypt*, *Alexandria*, and *Libya*, that *Athanasius* and his Friends were wholly innocent, and that their Accusers were ill men, Sycophants, and any thing rather than Christians.

\* *Soz. lib.*  
3. cap. 9.

† *Id. cap.*  
10.

‡ *Athanas. Ep.*  
*ad Solitar.*

† For *Athanasius* says, *Apol.*  
2. The Bishops that signed  
to his Innocence, in and out  
of the Synod, were 344;  
and that 60, before the Sy-  
nod, subscribed it, therefore  
there must be, at least, in  
this Synod 284 Bishops; the  
remainder of the former Num-  
ber by deducting 60. There  
are some Objections against  
this Computation. *Vid. Cau-*  
*sub. ex. Bar. and D' Comber's*  
*Roman Forgeries.*

|| Τὰς ἐκκλησιᾶς, ὡς οἱ  
κλῆς ἐν Σιχονίαις σιωχέχου-  
το, καὶ διαβόλαις ἦν. *Soz. ib.*

ans. † Now the Bishops that subscribed to this Ab-  
solution of *Athanasius*, were, as appears, 284. After  
these so contrary Proceedings of the Bishops, the  
|| Historian, indeed, makes this Remark, That the  
Bishops of the East and West did not use that Famili-  
arity with one another as before; and from hence  
the State of the Church, as in all probability it would, was  
disturbed by Dissentions, and lay under Calumnies. But  
here did not from hence arise an immortal Schism in  
the Church, as the Authour would pretend: for the  
Orthodox held a good Correspondence still with their  
Brethren in the West, however averse to their Friend-  
ship & Communion the *Arians* might be; and we may  
see, in many Councils after this, their mutual Friendship  
and Agreement. But what though there did arise some

Troubles in the Church, upon this dispute of our Saviour's Divinity?  
are the Orthodox to blame that asserted it, or the Hereticks that deny-  
ed it? Certainly these Troubles are owing to those only, whose Bla-  
phemous Assertions denied so important a Truth, and not to those  
that defended it, though their Defence might accidentally occasion  
some Troubles to ensue. For the Person that does the Wrong is an-  
swerable for all the accidental Damages that follow upon it; or other-  
wise the honest Possessor may be blameable for the defending his own  
goods to the damage of the unjust Aggressor. And in good truth,  
Thieves may, with as good a Face, charge honest Men with the Tu-  
mults they may accidentally raise, in defending themselves or their  
goods; as the Hereticks to charge the Orthodox with making Distrac-  
tions in the Church, by defending their Faith which was thus Here-  
tically opposed.

The Authour next gives two pretty reasons why the *Latin* Bishops  
were more easily lead by the Bishop of *Rome* than the *Greeks* were, (he  
supposing their Zeal for the Orthodox Doctrine to be only in com-  
pliance with that Bishop) which are, *First*, by reason of the *Great-*  
*ness* of his City; and, *Secondly*, the *Smallness* of their Understand-  
ings. I believe he brought in this Great and Small rather for a  
Witticism than a Reason. But why should they be lead by the Great-  
ness of his City? Men are wont to be jealous of every over-grown  
Power, and are sooner apt to oppose than assist it. But why should  
not the Bishop of *Constantinople*, by the same rule, have as many al-  
ways at his command? And why should not poor *Athanasius* Bishop of  
*Alexandria*, a mighty City too, draw as many of his Neighbours of  
his side? But the Authour is afraid that this Argument from the  
Greatness



Greatness of the City wo'n't do much, and therefore he don't much insist upon it; but that from the Smallness of the *Latin* Bishops Understandings, he thinks, is a good one; and this he endeavours to back with some proof, viz. with a Story of the *Latin* Bishops not apprehending a captious Question, which was put in the Council of *Ariminum*. Now, every one knows how easie it is for designing Knavery to impose upon well-meaning Honesty. A little Subtilty, with a great deal of Dishonesty, will over-reach a great number of wise and honest Men. Several of these tricks all that have read this History know, were used in this very Council. The Question was put, whether they believed in *Homo-ousium* or in Christ? If the Orthodox had said they believed in *Homo-ousium*, the *Arians* would have scoffed at them for believing only in a word. And when they said they believed in Christ, and not in *Homo-ousium*, they pretended they had given up their cause by discharging the *Homo-ousium*. Now 'tis but too frequent to find in many great Assemblies, that the Espousers of the true side are cheated out of their Voices by the fraudulent putting of the Question, and that possibly might be the case here. But besides, there was another reason for their then refusing the word *ὁμοούσιον*, because the Hereticks had gotten a sense of the word which favoured their Heresy; so that the \* Fathers did not reject the word, but only their sense of it.

\* Vid. Soc.  
lib. 1. cap.  
23. & Soc.  
lib. 2. cap.  
11.

This long and mischievous Controversy (as he calls it) he says was at last settled by *Theodosius*, which according to his compute in his last Paragraph, was (as he expresses it) after a hundred and fifty years struggling. But I am afraid he is a little out of his Chronology again, for he is mistaken but the odd hundred years, or thereabouts. For set the contest of *Arius* with *Alexander* the highest in the year 315, from that time to this Edict of *Theodosius*, in the year 379, are but 64 years, which are much short of his 150. But to pass over this, what though this Controversy was settled by *Theodosius*? Oh! the Author has an abundance to say to that in his reflections at last upon his whole relation. That this *Doctrine now established* (i. e. the Doctrine of our Saviour's Divinity) was advanced by gross partiality of the most guilty kind, and at last imposed by a Novice Emperour, upon implicit Faith, in two Bishops, &c. and so on with a long ranting period of some twenty lines. But to consider this a little. A Novice in Christianity, it is true, this Emperour was, because he received Baptism that year, or the year before he published this Edict, and yet the Edict might be never the worse for all that; but to be sure he sufficiently understood the Christian Religion before he was admitted to Baptism; and generally persons that come into the Church at those riper years, do take better

\* *Soc. Lib.*  
7. *Cap. 4.*

better care to inform themselves before Baptism, than others do after it. But why must this be an implicit Faith in two Bishops? He draws his Consequence from what \* *Soxomen* says, when he gives an account of this Edict, that the Emperour wills, that all his Subjects should embrace that Religion, which Peter, the Prince of the Apostles, had from the beginning deliver'd to the Romans, and which Damascus Bishop of Rome, and Peter Bishop of Alexandria, held. If here be an implicit Faith here is one in three Bishops, for Peter the Apostle was as good a Bishop as the other two, and the same Faith is said to be of all three. But how can he draw from these words, that he had an implicit Faith in the other? One certainly may use anothers Summary of Faith, having found it conformable to God's word, without believing implicitly as that other does; as well as I can use another Mans Form of Devotion, without praying implicitly with him. Now the reason why these two names are used by the Emperour is, because these Bishops were eminent Professours of the Orthodox Faith, amidst the many Heretical Doctrines then in the World, and were particular Defenders of it against *Arianism*. If any Man should say, he is for believing as the Ancient Fathers believed, for continuing in that Faith, in which the *Athanasius's*, *Cyrils*, *Chrysostoms*, *Nazianzens* did; that Faith which is still embraced and defended by the great and learned Men of our Church, and not for believing as the little heedless Authour of the *Naked Gospel* does. This would not be to believe implicitly on these great Men right or wrong, but only to shew 'tis more probable, that their Faith is better grounded, than that of every little trifling Heretick.

'Tis not worth while to examine all the Declamatory stuff he has brought towards the end of this Chapter, for 'tis a sure sign that Men want reason when they begin to declaim in such subjects; but in truth the Authour has no very good hand at this neither; for his strokes will raise no Mens Passions, unless their Anger, to see their Religion abused by such impudent, and witsal witless scurrility. And indeed 'tis enough to raise a Christians Zeal to an unusual Temper, to hear him at the end of his false and patch'd relation of this Controversy, to plume himself and vaunt, as if he had struck the Orthodox Cause for ever dead. Behold now the ground (says he) on which one of our fundamental Articles of Faith is built. Behold the justice of that Plea, which from such a possession would prescribe to our belief. This, and what after he says, that the *Athanasians* are to be numbred with the *Roman Doctrines*, is but common-place talk, and what may be said upon any thing a Man has a mind to vilify, though it be never so sacred.

The Authour, in the close of this Chapter, has hooked in some Arguments

Arguments to make us have a favourable Opinion of the *Arians*, and their Tenets, though 'tis nothing at all, as far as I can see, to his design in this Chapter. The first is a very good one. If *Alexander* himself, the head of the Party, could tolerate the *Arians*, we can ill pretend to Charity, if we allow them no title to God's Favour, or the Churches Communion. What *Alexander's* thoughts were of the *Arians*, as to God's favour, I believe our Authour can't tell, nor any one else at this distance, and therefore he can be no rule to us as to this matter. That he did Excommunicate some of these Hereticks, *Arius* himself, and some others mentioned by the Historians, are sufficient Instances; that he did not more was owing to their numbers, and not to his Opinion of their not deserving it. But as to his saying, we allow them no title to God's Favour; I suppose few will prescribe rules to that, any further than they find them prescribed by God himself. God Almighty may save, for ought as we know, thousands of Hereticks and Schismatics, but he has not in any ways let us know so much in his holy word: we find but one Faith there that we can be saved by, but one Church to communicate in, and to both which the promises of the Gospel are made; whatsoever God may do more is unknown to us, 'tis possible that he may do it, but he has no where declared he will. If he does afford Salvation to such Persons, 'tis not by the ordinary Methods of the Gospel, and what his extraordinary Methods are, God himself only knows. The ordinary way he has marked out to us there, is the rule for us to judge by, and those that do not walk by this, we may with Charity say, they are out of the common way of Salvation.

The next excuse the Authour makes for them is, because they may not see the ill consequences of their Doctrines, for he says, *if this make them Hereticks, it is only in Logick.* As for the *Arian* Doctrine, that was not Heresy by consequence, but a downright denial of our Lord's Divinity, and that was plain enough by *Arius's* disputes at first, though his Followers afterwards began to mince the matter, and so spin their Heresy a little finer when it became too odious to the vulgar, after the *Nicens* Determinations. But however, Heresy by deduction is still Heresy, as the Conclusion is virtually contained in the Premises, and the Corollaries in a Proposition. The Heretical Consequence is not less Heresy, because it is a little further removed than ordinary; for whatsoever is true after a thousand deductions, is true still, and 'tis the same in all manner of falsities. Nay there is a guilt contracted from this deductive Heresy as well as from the other, though such Heretical Person may not observe himself these Heretical, or other wicked consequences. For as in matter of practice, if a Man does

does a thing unlawful, though he may not apprehend all the ill consequences that may attend such an Action; he is answerable for these consequences when they come to pass; because he has entred upon an ill Action at first, and therefore must bear himself off afterwards as well as he can: thus it is in Heresy, though the Heretick denies a Truth in God's Word, the denial of which, at first sight, does not seem to have so much of Impiety; yet for this first fault, he is chargeable with the other impious Consequences, which are drawn from it. Thus when the *Arians* said, there was a time when Christ was not, though they did not expressly deny his Divinity, yet they are guilty of this too: though they pretend to abhor Idolatry, yet they are guilty of this, if they believe Christ to be a Created Being, and yet do worship him.

A third excuse for the *Arians* is upon account of their expounding Scripture, because, he says, they reconcile places, seemingly contrary, by the fairest Methods; and so because 'tis not the Custom of Writers, ever to diminish, but generally to advance the Character of the Person they write of; therefore 'tis reasonable, that those places which make Christ equal to the Father, should stoop to those that make him inferiour. This would be very true, if the Persons here spoke of had but one nature. If a Poet or Oratour, should call *Achilles*, or *Alexander*, a God, and in other places a Man, it would be but reasonable for the Reader to take the latter compellation to be the truest, and the other title of God to be only an Hyperbolical expression; because these persons, according to their Characters, could not be Gods and Men too, because they had only one humane nature, but were only stiled Gods from some great and godlike qualities, which were inherent in them. But our Saviour having two Natures, the Divine and the Humane, united into one Person, both compellations, in the Grammatical sense, might agree to him, without any Figure, or Hyperbole. But besides, our Saviour does not claim the name of the Son of God, as a great magnificent Title, to aggrandize his Office, as Princes use to emblazon their dignity by great swelling Characters; he came with another design into the World, than to make a fine gloriing show here; he came to preach up Meekness and Humility; and was the most perfect Instance of them that ever was in the World. Therefore if Christ was not God really and essentially, and should withal take upon him this Title of God, which is the greatest of all Titles, on purpose only to raise him an esteem in the World, as all Hyperbolical Titles are assumed for; he would be then far from maintaining his Character of being a Person of the greatest Humility; as he most certainly is, if being by Nature really God, he has conde-



seended to take upon him our Flesh. So that here is no need of running to a Figure to interpret these places, we may understand them easily enough in their bare Grammatical sense; for there is a thousand times more to be said for this, than for any of the *Securant* Figurative Constructions: And so I think I have spoke to every thing material in this Chapter.

## CHAP. X.

*Of the Word or Matter which is the Object of Faith.*

THE Authour begins this Chapter with a Discourse about Fundamentals of Belief, and by the way casts an odd sort of censure upon the Excellent Treatise of Dr. Hammond on that subject, which he says, is like an *Advertisment* in a Gazette, which however cannot secure one from mistake, if he meets the Man described. I am sure that is an Excellent Treatise, whatever the Authour thinks of it, and I am sure too, that admirable Man, has handled this subject a thousand times more learnedly and honestly, than the Authour has done it in this Chapter. 'Tis certain, that the Authour's Heresy will not stand with the Doctor's Enumeration of Fundamentals, and that's the reason, in all probability, that he speaks so slightly of it; and moreover, to say, the Doctor's Enumeration every one will not receive for adequate, for I believe he is one of that number: but certainly it is no defect in that Discourse, that it cannot secure every one from mistake that will blind his own Eyes; for the Fundamental Doctrines of Religion are plainly enough described there, but if the Authour wo'n't see them, the Doctor can't find him Eyes and description too. But let us see how the Authour has mended the matter in his handling the point. But instead of giving us an enumeration of the particulars, he has given us only some marks and qualifications of things to be believed, which too, if he had done it fairly enough, would have been pretty well.

1. And now the first qualification he makes for matters of Faith, is, *That they be easily understood by the meanest capacity.* I hope the Authour does not mean, that Men must understand every thing as far as they believe them, and to believe nothing but what they have a perfect knowledge of; for this would be to exclude all Faith out of the World, and to make Men Scepticks in every thing, but of which  
L they

they had demonstrative Science. If he means that there are no Fundamental Truths to be believed, but what the meanest capacity can adequately comprehend the express *modus* of them, this, I am sure, is more than ever he will be able to make out, however he may attempt it. As for what he brings of *the poor having the Gospel preached unto them*, and that the *light of the Gospel cannot be hid, but to those whose eyes are blinded*, and of *the simplicity which is in Christ*; these Texts the Authour has foisted in to no purpose, and contrary to their intent and meaning; for they are spoke only to shew, that the Christian Religion did not consist in Pharisaical Glosses, or deep Philosophical niceties, knowable only by a few learned Men; but in plain truths, which any one of a mean capacity might perceive, as far as was requisite for his Salvation. And one of these I have shewn the Doctrine of the holy Trinity to be, as to the belief of its existence, in the Answer to the Preface. But the Authour will have the Apostle St. Paul, Rom. 10. 9. to judge it a great defect of Faith, if there were any difficulty in it. For my part, I see nothing like such a judgment in this place of the Apostle, that it argues a defect of Faith to have the matter of it difficult to believe. Nay the reasoning of the Apostle there seems to be grounded upon the contrary to this. *If thou shalt believe in thine heart that God raised Christ from the dead, thou shalt be saved.* That is, if thou shalt believe such a wonderful thing as Christ's Resurrection, which is so strange and difficult to be believed by all carnal Men, thou shalt be saved. But why should difficulty make a defect of Faith? it has been generally looked upon as a great increase and exaltation of Faith, when the matter has been hard to believe, as in *Abraham*, who believed against hope, and whose Faith, for this very reason, the Authour did extraordinarily celebrate a Chapter or two before, however he may have forgot himself now. The calling of the Gentiles indeed, he allows to be something of a Mystery, and difficult to believe under the Gospel, but he is very positive, that *in no other word of Scripture we meet the least intimation, that Faith hath any hard task for the understanding to perform.* But I thought there might have been some difficulty in the belief of the Gospel itself; by reason of our Saviour's calling his Religion a Yoke, wherein Mens Carnal Reasons were to be subjugated as well as their Affections, by his being set for the fall of many; by reason that the Gospel was a stumbling block to the Jews, and to the Greeks foolishness, &c. all which plainly shews, there is at least some intimation of a difficulty for Faith under the Gospel.

2. His second Qualification, is, *That matter of Faith must be the express word of God.* This rule of the Authour holds well enough, yea so well, that I am afraid he will never stand by it, when it comes to the

the Issue. For if the Socinians, or other Opposers of Christ's Divinity, would once come to be determined by express Texts of Scripture, that controversy would quickly be at an end. For there are so many express Texts against them, that we cannot desire more; and these they will own are express, as to the word and letter; but then are forced to put false and strained Interpretations upon them, to make them look another way. For our Saviour is expressly called God, Joh. 1. 1. *The word was God. Of whom, as concerning the flesh, Christ came, who is God over all, blessed for ever,* Rom. 9. 5. Thomas calls him *my Lord and my God.* So Heb. 1. 8. *Thy Throne, O God, is for ever and ever.* So the Divine Attributes are ascribed to him. Omnipresence Joh. 14. 23. *Matth. 28. 20. and 18. 20.* Omnipotence *Phil. 3. 21. Rev. 1. 8.* Immutability *Heb. 1. 11, & 12.* Omniscience *Joh. 21. 17. Joh. 11. 25. Rev. 11. 23.* So likewise the Holy Ghost is called expressly God, *Act. 5. 4. Why hath Satan filled thy heart to lie unto the Holy Ghost, --- thou hast not lied unto men, but unto God, v. 4.* So are the Divine Attributes ascribed unto him. As Omnipresence *Psal. 139. 7. 1 Cor. 3. 16. & 6. 19.* Eternity *1 Cor. 11. 10. Joh. 15. 26.* Omniscience *1 Cor. 11.* Omnipotence *Luk. 11. 20. Luk. 1. 35. 1 Cor. 1. 11.* These are not the tenth part of the places in Scripture which may be alledged for the proof of the Trinity, besides that express one to prove a Trinity in Unity, *1 John 5. 7.* though without that, there is enough to establish this Doctrine in the minds of all unprejudiced Men. And to see what work the Socinians make to invalidate these proofs, what jejune and foolish interpretations they pass upon them, so contrary oftentimes to the whole design and tenour of the Authours, this would make any one think, that they had taken up a Paradox to defend, and were resolved to say any thing to maintain it, rather than to be perfectly silent. Well! but what if the relation between the written word and the rational consequence, be so remote, that none but a skilful Herald can derive its Pedigree? Why this is not the case of the Doctrine of the Trinity, for all the Authour's halt. For first, this is plainly asserted in that famous place of St. John, *1 Joh. 5. 7.* And the Authority of this Text is good for all our Adversaries' appeal to some Manuscripts to the contrary; and we have \* St. Cyprian to vouch for it, who is older than any Manuscripts they can pretend to. But secondly, supposing this Text was wanting in Scripture, the Doctrine of the Trinity is plain enough for all that. We have express assertion there, that each of the three Persons are God, by the places for instance we just now alledged; and we are likewise assured, as well from natural reason as from Scripture, that God is but one, *Hear, O Israel, thy God is but one God, Deut. 6. 9.* Now any Man, without any great skill in Heraldry, or Logick either, can from hence conclude, that God is in some manner, he does not understand, three and yet one,

\* Vid. Cyprian.  
Cum notis  
Episc. Oxon.

which is all the notion any one can have of the Trinity. Here is no such remote distance *between the word and the consequence*, but any one of the meanest Capacity may find out; for Men in their ordinary business every day make conclusions at a wider distance from their premises than this; or else I am sure they are not fit to live or deal in the World. As to what he instances in the consequence, which the Papists draw from Christ's bidding *Peter feed his Lambs*, the Papists, when they think fit, may answer that for themselves.

3. The Third Qualification he gives for Matter of Faith, is, *That it be expressly honoured in Scripture with the promise of Eternal Life*. Now 'tis a little arbitrary methinks in the Authour, to lay down a Rule here as he does, and give no reason for it, especially such a one as he might reasonably expect would be contested: and if any one should make bold to deny it, he would, I believe, have a difficult Task of it to prove, That every particular Article, of only the Apostles Creed, had the Promise of Eternal Life expressly annexed to it in Scripture. He first tells us a wonderful thing, That every thing in Scripture, though it be equally true, yet it is not equally Gospel; and for the Proof of this, he brings in the business of *Paul's Cloak*, which he left behind him. But, I hope, the Doctrine of our Saviour's Divinity is of something more Importance, to those that believe it especially, than the Relation of *Paul's Cloak*. And if we should ask any *Socinian* in the World, whether, supposing it true, it was not of greater Importance than this; I believe the *Unitarian* himself would give such an Answer, as would make the Authour ashamed of such an impudent and saucy Comparison. And now one would think, that the Man that would be so bold, as to make this Comparison, would bring something to prove, That the Belief of Christ's Divinity had not Eternal Life promised to it; or that all other Doctrines, which were required to be believed, had. But, instead of this, he brings one Text of Scripture which makes perfectly against the Doctrine he designs to establish; and that is *Mark 16. 15. Go ye into all the World and preach the Gospel to every Creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned*. Now if the Doctrine of our Saviour's Divinity be revealed in the Gospel, as we have shewn it is, and the Belief of the Gospel have Eternal Life promised to it; then the Belief of Christ's Divinity has a Title to this Promise, as well as the Belief of the Resurrection, or any other Christian Doctrine; because it is revealed in the Gospel as well as that. From this Rule, thus firmly established, he draws four Corollaries.

*First*, There is no need of an Interpreter of Scripture, or Determiner of Doubts in Matter of Faith.

*Secondly*, The Scriptures cannot be denied to be sufficient.

*Thirdly*,



Thirdly, We need not, ought not to be uncharitable to any, who differ from us in other Doctrines, to the Belief whereof the Promise is not appropriated.

Fourthly, There is no need of a Catalogue of Fundamentals.

How well these Corollaries follow from his Proposition, I shall not now dispute; though upon examination, I believe, the Consequence would not be so genuine, and there might be some occasion for one of the Authour's Heralds to derive it; but as for the Two first of them, they make nothing at all against the Orthodox Doctrine of the Trinity, which the Authour knows well enough we do not ground upon Infallibility and pure Tradition; but only he has a Mind to give us a Cast of his Heretical Malice, by blackening this Doctrine as much as he could, and by making it look something more of a *Romanish* Complexion.

As to his Third Corollary. First, That is grounded upon Supposition, That the Belief of Christ's Divinity has not the Promise of Eternal Life annexed to it. Now I wonder with what Confidence the Authour can go about to invalidate a Truth, which is so firmly established even upon his own Principles. How often in one Chapter of St. John's Gospel, *Joh. 3.* is Eternal Life promised to Belief in the Son? *God so loved the World that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have everlasting life, Joh. 3. 16. He that believeth on him, is not condemned. v. 18. He that believeth on the Son hath eternal Life.* By all which believing is meant a believing in Christ's Divinity, and not a believing the Truth of his Doctrine: for *believing in* is only attributable to God, as implying an unlimited Trust and Relyance in him; which is Idolatry to afford to any Creature. \* For there is a great deal of difference between

*credere Deo*, believing God, and *credere in Deum* believing in him; which is a Distinction which is made great use of by some of the Latin Fathers and the School-men; they allowing bare believing to be applicable to a Creature, but that none is to be believed in but Almighty God. *Nunquam aliquis Apostolorum credidit in Deum, sed non credimus in Apostolum Tract. 54 in Psal. And again, Credimus Paulo, sed non credimus in Paulum; Credimus Petro, sed non credimus in Petrum.* And so again, in another place, he distinguishes between *credere Christum*, & *credere in Christum*. *multum interest utrum credat ipsum esse Christum, & utrum credat in Christum. Ille credit in Christum, qui & sperat in Christum, & diligit Christum. Tract. 29 in Job. Vid. Aq. Sum. 2. 22 q. 2. §. 2. Durand. in 3. sent. disp. 23. q. 7. §. 6.*

But besides there are other Texts of Scripture, which do promise Eternal Life, namely and expressly to the Belief of Christ's Divinity.

This is life eternal, that they may know thee the only true God, and Jesus

*Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent*, Joh. 17. 3. Now what can be meant by knowing Jesus Christ, but knowing or believing his Divinity? That he was Man they could not chuse but know, that he was a Prophet his Miracles shew'd; so that they could know him no other way truly, but only by knowing his Divinity. And this was the Purport of our Saviour's Prayer just before, That God would glorifie him; that is, would make his Divinity conspicuous to the World, v. 1. which he puts out of all doubt, by his explaining his meaning, v. 5. *And now, O Father, glorifie thou me with thy own self, with the glory which I had with thee before the World was.* Now that Glory which he had before the World, could be only the Glory of his Divinity; therefore the Promise of Eternal Life was made, to the knowing or believing Christ's Divinity. The same thing is as plainly expressed, 1 Joh. 5. 20. *And hath given us an understanding, that we may know him that is true: and we are in him that is true, even in his Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God, even eternal life.* Where he that is the true God is said to be Jesus Christ, and the knowing him to be the true God (i. e.) believing him to be such, is promised to be rewarded with Eternal Life. Secondly, As to his saying we ought not to be uncharitable to those, that differ from us in Points which have not this Promise; this depends upon the Truth of his Assertion, that those Truths, he means, have not such a Promise in Scripture, which we have proved the Doctrine of our Saviour's Divinity to have. So that, upon our Authour's own Principles, we may reason thus. If Eternal Life be promised to those, and to those only, that believe Christ's Divinity, then those that do dis-believe it have no Title to Eternal Life. But we have proved that Christ has promised it to those, and to those only, that believe his Divinity, therefore, &c. For Christ's promising Eternal Life to those that should believe his Divinity, supposes the Promise is to them only; for if it were to be given to others, it were no kind of Invitation and Encouragement to them for to believe it; seeing then they might attain it without it. If the Consequence, which is naturally drawn from this, be uncharitable, 'tis what results from the Authour's own Principles, which he himself has laid down; and then he may thank himself for that.

As to his Fourth Corollary, *That then there is no need of a Catalogue of Fundamentals*; this is a stroke too of his usual Confidence, by which he taxes no less Men than the very Apostles themselves, of a foolish unnecessary labour. For if there was no need of a Catalogue of Fundamentals, why should the Apostle exhort *Timothy* so earnestly to hold fast the form of sound words, which was undoubtedly in our Authour's Phrase, a Catalogue of Fundamentals, or some brief Summary of Faith,

Faith, probably that Creed which we have now under the Apostles Names? Why should the Apostles, or some other Apostolical Men set themselves to collect together the Chief Heads of our Christian Faith, for the Instruction of their new Converts, if it were nothing but a needless Work? The Apostles hands were then too full of business, to do any thing but what was absolutely necessary; and the Holy Spirit, which was to guide them into all Truth, would certainly keep them from writing what was unnecessary, as well as what was false; for Impertinence, though it is not a Contradiction to, yet, is a Hindrance of Truth as well as Falshood. I shall not insist here how he reflects by this upon the Actions of so many Venerable Councils; for 'tis the usage of this Gentleman's Tribe to be fussy with those Sacred Assemblies; but methinks he should be more civil to his beloved Friends, the *Arians* and *Socinians*. Will he allow, that *Arim*, and *Euzoins*, and *Eusebins* of *Casarea*, &c. were only playing the Fools, whilst they were drawing up their Creeds? Will he own his celebrated *Arian* Councils of *Antioch*, *Ariminum*, *Seleucia*, &c. to be only at his *Push-pin*, whilst they were contriving their Heterodox Forms of Faith? And had the *Socinian* Brethren nothing to do, when they wrote their Summaries of Religion, which are Catalogues of their Fundamentals? I am afraid this is something more than, upon second Thoughts, he will readily grant. But for all our Authour's Positiveness, a Creed is no such unnecessary Work as he may think. What though the Scripture be a compleat Rule of Faith, a Creed may not be a needless one for all that. Though the Scripture contains every thing necessary to Salvation, yet Comments upon Scripture, and Sermons and Catechisms, I hope, are not wholly impertinent. All the necessary Points of Faith, 'tis true, are found somewhere or other dispersed through the Bible, but 'tis too difficult for Children and Novices, and many others, who have not so much leisure to search them out there; therefore 'tis very necessary, for these, to have a brief Summary of Faith to be drawn up out of them for their use; which they may quickly read over, and easily remember. Besides Creeds are of great advantage in the Church, to shew us the Belief of the Primitive Ages; which as they were nigher to the Apostolick times, so they could know better the Apostolick Faith, than others, that were at a remoter distance; and therefore by these we have a better Knowledge of the Primitive Faith, than if we had the Assistance of the Scripture only. Though the Scripture it self is a good and sufficient Rule, yet these Ancient Creeds are useful Explanations of it: though the Scripture be the great primary Rule of Faith, yet the Creeds of the Ancient Church may be secondary ones, as being formed

formed by the first, and more adapted to some particular Capacities, and some peculiar Circumstances.

The Authour next, I find, is afraid that he has not laid his first Proposition firm enough, upon which he has been building all these Corollaries; and therefore he is for butteressing it afterwards, as well as he can. But instead of this, he has unluckily made his Foundation weaker than it was before; for whereas at first he allowed some Truths to be honoured with the Promise of Eternal Life, here he will allow but one in all the Bible to be so; and that is the Belief of our Saviour's Resurrection. And now having brought the Q. of the 10th. of the Romans, v. 9. to prove this, *If thou shalt believe in thy heart that God hath raised [Jesus] from the dead thou shalt be saved*; he very triumphantly asks the Question, *Do we in the whole New Testament find any other Doctrine so honoured?* Yes, we have proved the Doctrine of our Saviour's Divinity to be so honoured; and I wonder what the Authour thinks of the Doctrine of Repentance; whether any Man can be saved without that, or whether Eternal Life be not promised to it? Whether it is not promised to the Belief of the true God? *This is life eternal, to know thee the only true God, &c. Joh. 17. 3.* In short, Eternal Life is promised, either exprelly or virtually, to every Article of the Christian Belief, and to the Practice of every Christian Precept, but not to one singly without the other. The Apostle tells us, *Rom. 8. 24. We are saved by hope*: and yet undoubtedly he requires the Exercises of other Vertues with it: and though Salvation is promised to the Belief of Christ's Resurrection, yet, to be sure, God expects our Assent likewise to all other Articles of the Christian Faith. Bare Hope will as well save a Man without Faith and Charity, as a bare Belief of our Saviour's Resurrection without a Belief of his Divinity; for one is revealed in Scripture as well as the other, and each of them have the same Promises of Eternal Life annexed to them. But suppose one of them lacked this Promise exprelly made to it, it were not less to be believed for all that; any more than we do not think our selves at liberty to neglect the Practice of Charity, because we are not in Scripture said to be saved by it, as we are by Hope. The Reason why the Scripture, particularly the Epistles of the Apostles, does often back the Belief of the Doctrine of the Resurrection with this Promise, is, because this Point, of all others in the Christian Religion, was the most difficult to go down with the Heathens which the Apostles had to do withal; it was so contrary to the received Principles of their \* Philosophy, and the

\* This was a Point so difficult to be believed, that *Synefius* the Philosopher could not be persuaded of the Truth of it, not only till after he became a Christian, but till he had for some time been Priest. *Avag. lib. 1. cap. 15.*



avowed Opinions of the great Masters in the *Græcian* Schools; and therefore 'twas but reasonable, that the Apostles should give the greatest Encouragement they could, to further the Belief of it, when it lay under so many Prejudices amongst them.

## CHAP. XI.

*Of the Manner of the Resurrection; whether in the same Body, or another.*

I cannot imagine why the Author should single out this Heterodoxy alone, out of all the *Socinian* Errours, to join with his Denial of our Saviour's Divinity. One would have thought, He might rather have contested the Doctrine of the Satisfaction; or the Divinity of the Holy Ghost; which would have made his Book look more of a piece, than now it does. But why he should single out this, above all the other Points of the *Socinian* Controversie, I can give no reason for, unless having talked about Resurrection in the last Chapter, that gave him a hint to make a ramble into a discourse of it here. However the Case stands, I shall give an Answer to what he says against the received Doctrine of the Church, in this Point, as short and as plain as I can. And, in order to this, I will shew,

*First*, the Necessity of Mens rising again in the same numerical Bodies.

*Secondly*, I shall answer those Arguments which this Author brings against the Truth of this Doctrine.

*First*, The Necessity of Mens rising again with the same numerical Bodies they laid down in the Grave.

'Tis not easie to guess, what 'tis these *Socinian* Gentlemen would have to rise again, if not the Body; 'tis impossible that the Soul should be said to rise again, because that never fell; for all Rising supposes a Falling. *Resurgere non est nisi ejus quod cecidit*, Nothing can rise but what has fell, says *Tertullian*, in the same case, *adv. Marc. lib. 5. cap. 9.* Therefore it does necessarily follow, That 'tis the Body must arise, if there be any Resurrection. Besides, our Saviour, who is the great \* Original and Archetype of our Resurrection, or, as the Apo-

stle speaks, *the first fruits of them that sleep*; he arose in the same Body that he deposited in the Grave; and therefore our Bodies that are to

\* *Si ad exemplum Christi resurgemus*

*qui resurrexit in Carne; jam non ad exemplum Christi resurgemus, si non in Carne & ipsi resurgemus.*

*Tertul. de Resur. Car. cap. 18.*

*be*

be fashioned like to his glorious Body, must be the same Bodies, as his was the same; or else they will not be conformable to their Original: but farther, I know not what Truth can be revealed plainer than this is, in the holy Scripture. Not to insist upon *Job 19. 26. I know that my Redeemer liveth, &c.* nor on *Dan. 12. 2. Many of them that sleep in the Dust, &c.* though these are evident Proofs enough of this Doctrine, yet several Texts in the New Testament are unexceptionable, as particularly, *Joh. 5. 28, 29. For the Hour is coming, in which all that are in the graves, shall hear his voice, and shall come forth: they that have done good unto the Resurrection of Life, and they that have done evil unto the Resurrection of Damnation.*

† Nemo poterit aliud mortuos interpretari qui sint in monumentis nisi Corpora & Carnem, quia nec ipsa monumenta aliud quam cadaverum stabula. id. ib. cap. 37. || Contr. Frantz. p. 414. & 170.

† Now what is that which is in the graves, but only the Bodies of Men? to be sure, their Souls are not there; therefore if these Words have any propriety of speech it must be, that then the Bodies of Men that are in their Graves shall arise. The consequence of this is so plain, that || *Smalcius* the *Socinian* will have this to be understood only in a figurative sense, that nothing is meant here but the Calling of the Gentiles; that by the Dead are meant Aliens from the Faith; that by hearing the Voice of the Son is understood the Hearing the Gospel preached: but how foolish this Interpretation is, may be known from the Distinction which is here made, of those that are to arise, into Good and Bad. For if here be meant only such a Resurrection as he means, from Sin to Grace, then all were Bad, because they all were in a state of Sin; and so there is no room for the other Branch of the Distinction, *those that have done good*, so that this must be perfectly superfluous. And so again, this is as plain from *Rom. 8. 11. He that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your Mortal Bodies by his Spirit which dwelleth in you*: Where those Bodies which are to be quickened or revived, are the *τὰ σὰρὰ σκῶτα*, the mortal or dying Bodies, and therefore the Bodies to be quickened or raised cannot be any other Bodies, than those which did die. Besides, those Bodies are said to be quickened, in which the Holy Ghost dwells; now they are these very Bodies which are the Temples of the Holy Ghost, *1 Cor. 3. 16. cap. 6. 15.* therefore they are these very Bodies which are to be quickened or raised again. To this may be added the constant Consent of the Catholic Church. The *Latin* understood this by their *Carnis resurrectionem* in their Creed, and the *Greeks* by the *Σαρκὸς ἀνάστασις* in theirs; but of all, the \* *Aquileian* Creed was most particular, for this had *hujus Carnis resurrectionem*, the Resurrection of this very Flesh. This was the Doctrine of the Ancient Fathers of the Church, *Justin, Tertullian, Anaxagoras, Cyprian, Austin, Hierom*, and all others, till the *Socinians* began to turn all the Articles of the Christian Faith upside down, and, among the rest to overthrow the Orthodox Belief

\* Pro eo quod ceteri dicunt Carnis Resurrectionem, nos dicimus hujus Carnis Resurrectionem. Ruff. Apol. adv. Hier.

# the Naked Gospel

ties of the Resurrection. This is enough to show, that this was the  
 belief of \* learned Men in the first Ages of the  
 Church; nor was it less the belief of other Christi-  
 ans. Or else what should be the cause that this Do-  
 ctrine of the Resurrection should seem so difficult  
 † to be believed, if the Resurrection was nothing but  
 the Soul's being clothed with another Body, why  
 should that be more hard to be credited, than that  
 God could cloath it with a Body at first? For he  
 that gave it a Body at first, could with as great ease  
 give it another Body, when that was gone. Here is  
 no difficulty at all here: but this was the thing that  
 confounded their Faith, ¶ how a Body should be rais-  
 ed again, that had so long lain rotten in the Grave,  
 that had passed through so many Transmutations,  
 that was turned into the substance of so many dif-  
 ferent Bodies, how all these scatter'd parts should  
 leave the Bodies, they should then help to make up,  
 and be ranged together into their old form. This in-  
 deed would be apt to strain the Faith of a great many,  
 but no one could be so foolish to stand out against Christianity, upon  
 the incredibility of the other opinion. Besides, if this was not the  
 Faith of the Ancient Christians, what means those malicious exprobra-  
 tions of the Heathens to them, by setting them the Bodies of their  
 Martyrs, half devoured by Lyons, by burning their Bodies, and then  
 scattering their Ashes into Rivers? But only because they thought this  
 did make the Resurrection they believed utterly impossible. What  
 else could be the meaning of the great care which the Primitive Chri-  
 stians took of the Bodies of their deceased Friends; upon which \*Ter-  
 tullian says, they were more prodigal, than the Heathens were in in-  
 censing their Gods. If they thought their dead Friends Souls would  
 never have any further relation to their Bodies, they would certainly  
 never have treated them with that extraordinary respect and honour,  
 as they did.

\* Justin. Mart. Resp. 53. ad  
Ortodoxos. & Resp. 60. Athanas.  
de resur. Mitt. prope finem.  
Tertullian. De. citatis. Cyr.  
expof. Symb. Hier. Com. in Job.  
19. Aug. in Pf. 62. Theophyl. in  
1 Cor. 14. Chryfoft. in Job. &c.

† The *Valentinians* were the chief, if not the only Heretics that denied the Resurrection of the finite numerical Body in ancient times. Τῶν τῶν ὑποκόπων ἀνθρώπων ἀντίτυποι οὐκ ἀσώτως τὶ μυθώδεις τὴν λαοφάνειαν καὶ τὸ σῶμα τῆς ἀνθρώπου ἀν. Ἰερογ. μὲν ἐξ αὐτῆς εἰ δὲ σπινθηροειδὲς καλῶνται. Ep. Hæz. 31.

¶ *Durius creditur Resurrectio  
carnis quam una Divinitas. Ter-  
tal. de ref. Carnis Cap. 1.*

\* Si Arabie querruntur, sciant Sabaei plures & cariorum suam merces Christianis sepeliendis profligari, quam Deis fumigantibus. Textus Apol. Cap. 23.

Quid sibi facere cōvāt,

*Quid pulchra voluit monumentis?*

Nisi quod res creditur illis.

*Non mortua, sed data somno.* Prud. Nym. 10. circa exte. defun.

Secondly, As to the answering of the objections which the Authour makes against the truth of this Doctrine, I shall consider them singly as they lie in his Book, which I shall do within a little compass; for though his Chapter is long, his Arguments are but few, and what is somewhat better, those not over-strong neither.

His first Argument is groundd upon the words of the Apostle, *Thou Fool thou sowest not that body which shall be, but God giveth it a body as it hath pleased him. Doth not this* (says the Authour) *plainly deny a Resurrection of the same numerical Particles?* As plain as this is, no one can see it without a pair of Socinian Spectacles, and how clear sighted they may make a Man, I thank God I do not know. But let us see a little, how plain this is. This place alledged is at best but a similitude the Apostle uses, to explain the Resurrection by, and therefore it must not be drawn further than the Apostle designed it should; we must not extend it beyond his purpose, which was only to inform us of the quality of the bodies we are to arise with, and not to assert a substantial diversity. But to keep to the instance; the Body which is here sown is not the Body which arises in respect of the quality indeed, but yet it is in respect of the substance; the substance is the same still, though it be changed by alteration of quality, or augmentation of quantity; it does not arise *such* as it was sown 'tis true, but yet it does arise the *same*; it arises *trūe*, as the Apostle speaks, though not *trūe*. For Augmentation does not make a thing not the same, it only increases the Bulk, but does not diversify the *Individuum*; as a Tree, which is grown to a fathom or two about, is the same Tree, as when it was but an inch or two over. But however, it is not necessary that this simile of the Seed should hold universally, as to the matter of the Resurrection; for there is no need of that extraordinary addition of quantity to our Bodies which are to arise, as there is to the Grain to be changed into the Blade. 'Tis not necessary that our Bodies should be larger than they are now, that there should be need of growth to increase them, as there is to increase the Grain: therefore our Bodies will be more the same, than the Bodies the Apostle instances in are; for they need not so great an Addition of matter as the Grain does, and so may be the same as to quantity too.

His second Argument is, that there is no reason, that the same numerical Body should arise upon that account, which many of the Ancients have given; that those Bodies which were sharers in the Sin, should be sharers in the Punishment: \* because Matter (says he) has no share in either; it neither acts nor perceives, and therefore is

\* *Omne  
premium  
omnisq; pe-*

*na vim eatenus reverā habet quatenus sentitur, spiritu autem fieri, ut sentiamus, non corpore quā Corpus est; Corpus instrumentum tantum esse nec per se puniri.* Says *Crestius* on the 1 Cor. 15. and from whence probably the Authour has his Argument.



not liable to punishment. This indeed is an Argument which several of the Ancients use to prove a Resurrection of the same Body, which they do not lay such stress upon, as if the whole Truth of this Doctrine was built on this: they use it as a probable Argument, which though by it self is not of so great weight, yet when joined with others, it may add some strength to them. But to examine this a little. It is true, matter in its own nature is not capable of being punished, because it has no perception; but yet matter is capable of undergoing the divine Malediction, God may set a mark of his displeasure upon it, or in the Scripture Language Curse it, and that in inanimate beings is analogous to punishment in sensible ones. And thus we find God frequently Curses inanimate things; for some relation they have or had to guilty persons; thus he is said, Gen. 3. 17. *to curse the ground for mans sake.* Thus the places where the wicked Inhabitants of Sodom and Gomorrah dwelt, lie under such a Malediction; *suffering the Vengeance of eternal fire,* Jud. 7. Thus the Prophet tells the People of Judah, *because of the Abomination they have committed, their land is become a Curse,* Jer. 44. 22. Now though the Body, being considered purely as matter, cannot undergo punishment, properly so called, because it cannot suffer pain; yet it may undergo the Divine Excommunication, as other inanimate Bodies do, and so be raised up to suffer this in lieu of a proper punishment, for being so highly related to a wicked Soul. But however the Body is not to be esteemed as only pure insensible Matter, and only an instrument of pain and pleasure; for the Body it self is sensible by an internal principle of its own, and not by the rational Soul, though that be the governing Principle; and is therefore of its self capable of suffering pain, and enjoying Corporeal Pleasure, without relation to the Soul. Now though the Body, in this sense, cannot be said to deserve punishment, because it cannot contract guilt, as wanting reason; yet as being an essential part in the composition of a Man, it is reasonable, that that should partake of all the rewards and punishments, which the Soul doth: and because it was the whole Man, the *Compositum* of Body and Soul that sinned, so likewise it is reasonable, that the whole *Compositum* should suffer. And upon this account \*Tertullian would have the Body, in a man, to undergo a judgment; because it is not so much an instrument of the Soul as a Servant; which though it does not act of it self, is yet a portion of that which does act.

*Natura carnem non instrumentum praestat in operationibus, sed ministerium. Ita et ministerium tenebitur iudicio esse de suo nihil sciat, quid portio est ejus quia sapit, non suspexit.* Tert. de Res. Car. Where the word *Ministerium*, signifies a Servant, not Service, or the Act or Office of serving. As *Publica ministeria dicimus etiam quae extra urbem nobis ministrare consueverunt.* Paul. 1c. *Quindecim conviviarum ac ministerii capace triclinio.* Plin. Lib. 12.

His third Argument is, that though God might by his Omnipotence, raise up the same numerical Bodies, yet it would argue a defect in his Wisdom, to exercise his Omnipotency when less means will serve. I am sure the Authour, by this Argument, does undervalue the Divine Nature a thousand times more than that opinion he endeavours to overthrow by it. For he supposes things are difficult and easy, in respect of God, which is a manifest absurdity. For to be difficult and easy, for any thing to do, does suppose an imperfection, because it supposes a limited power. For a thing is then difficult to be done by any person or thing, when the power that resists is almost equal to the power which acts; and a thing is easy to be done, when the power which acts is much greater than the power which resists; but this always supposes a limited Power. But in an Infinite Power there is no proportion with any thing that is finite, and therefore nothing can be difficult or easy in respect of that. God does every thing by his Omnipotent Power; he does one thing with as great ease as another; because the greatest thing he does, is as far from setting his Omnipotent Power as the smallest; his Power to act is infinitely greater than any Power to resist, and though one thing may seem more difficult than another to us, because we find their resistibility to be so much greater or less than our limited Power of acting, yet God's Power is infinitely greater than the most difficult of them; and therefore can do one as easily as the other. It seems to us indeed, that we have a finite narrow understanding, that can attend to and discern only a few things that are just before us, very difficult, to find out so many scatter'd Atoms, that lie it may be in so many Millions of different places; because we cannot discern different things lying in different places; and therefore all such disorder confounds our understandings; but God, who is Omniscient, and knows exactly all things every where, nothing can lie disorderly to him; he knows where every such Atom lies, as well as when it possessed its place in the Organized Body; and can, with as great ease, make them return to their former station, as to make the new separated Soul go back to the Body, that lies yet entire. Nay 'tis not so great an act of God's Power to range all this scattered matter together, as to create another Body for the Soul to be united to; for 'tis possible, that all this matter might be gathered together from never so many different places, by a finite Power only; and 'tis not improbable to think God may do this by the Ministry of his holy Angels: but 'tis God alone that can create another Body, and therefore this would be rather (in our Authour's phrase) to make God unaccountably exercise his Omnipotency; because it would put God to the expence of a new Creation, to make  
a Body

a Body to be united to the Soul, when the old one would do as well.

His fourth Argument is against those that make it some advancement of the joys at the Resurrection, that we shall be united to our old Bodies, which will be like the joyful meeting and embracing of old Friends; which he says will not be of old Friends but of old Enemies, because of the War between the Flesh and the Spirit, *Rom. 7.* and therefore the Soul cannot rejoice at her being united to her former Body. 'Tis true indeed, that several Ancient and Modern Writers have made use of this, as a Rhetorical Argument, to set forth, in some part, the joy of that happy day; and truly I think not without some reason. For we find the Soul has a great love to the Body, both by reason of its being so loth to part with it, and because it is found to hanker after the Body, after its separation; which is the account which some give of *Speltrums*. But besides, we find in Men a secret love and esteem for every thing that has any relation to themselves; they love their Relations, as being born of the same stock, they have an esteem for every thing belonging to their native Country; they have an extraordinary kindness for their *nutriculi Lares*, the House in which they were born and bred: and this Love seems always greater, after a considerable time of absence from them. Now when a Mans Body is the most nighly related to him, as being an essential part of himself, he cannot but be more joyed to be united again to that which is so near to him, than to see his native Country, or the House he was born in after a long time of absence from him. As for the enmity between the Flesh and the Spirit he mentions, that is only an Enmity Metaphorically so called; because all proper Enmity is between two rational beings, which are endowed with free wills, which the Soul and the Body are not; nay, that reluctance of the sensual nature to the dictates of the understanding, which is Metaphorically expressed, by War or Enmity, between the Flesh and Spirit, that is very well appeased in the regenerate Man; so that he has no reason to hate his Body for that, especially now he has master'd it; for these inward strugglings of the Flesh, have made his Vertue greater to overcome them, and therefore he may reasonably expect for this a greater Reward in proportion to his Vertue.

ENQUIRY

## ENQUIRY II.

*What Changes or Additions latter Ages have made in Matters of Faith?*

OUR Authour has been hitherto giving us a Hodge-podge of *Arianism* and *Socinianism*, and some Heresie of his own which wants a Name; and this he calls giving us an account, *What was the Gospel our Lord and his Apostles preached, as necessary to Salvation*, which was the first Enquiry. And now, when he enters upon his second, *What Additions latter Ages have made in Matters of Faith*, one would expect, that, according to the Tenour of his Book, he should give an account, how the Doctrine of the Trinity came into the World; what *Platonick* Notions gave rise to the Opinion of our Saviour's Divinity; that *Plato's* Doctrine of the *Logos* came from the *Greeks* to the *Hellenistical Jews*, and so from them to the Christians; one would, I say, have expected something of this matter, which is used to fill up the Books of the late *Socinians* and *Atheists*, when they have a mind to blaspheme the ever Blessed Trinity. But our Authour, I find, either wants Courage, or Reading, or something else to set upon this Enterprize, and therefore contents himself only with a little nibbling at this Doctrine; but turns the whole Current of his Argument against the *Papists*, and their Innovations. Indeed his Charge of Innovations seems to lie against the Orthodox in general; but when he comes to make good his Challenge, he shams us off with an Instance or two against the *Papish* Errours. But let us consider what these Innovations are, he so boldly charges us with.

1. He says, *We extend the Empire of Faith as far as possible*; and this he proves very strenuously, by that vast Army of new Doctrines of Faith, which the School-men have got, by the Bishop of Rome's setting up for an Oracle to declare that Matter of Faith, which was before Matter of Curiosity; by implicit Faith in the Church, &c. But what does all this stuff signifie to us of the Church of England? or who else does he mean by this *We*? If he means *We Papists*, and so reckons himself one of that number, his Brethren will give him little thanks for thus exclaiming against their Corruptions. If he means *We Protestants*, or Church of England, here is not one Tittle of Proof of the Charge against us; we abhor all these *Romish* Corruptions, as much as the Authour possibly can do. We extend Faith no farther than the Holy Scripture does; what that tells us we ought to believe, that we readily



dily do believe; but do not take into our Belief any thing, but what the Scripture does expressly assert, or but what may, by manifest deduction, be drawn from it. And when the Authour shall offer any proof that we do, he shall not want an Answer. But I hope he does not take this for proof, to lay down Propositions against the Orthodox in general, and make his proof only against the *Papists*.

2. His second Charge of Innovation is, *That we exalt Faith above Holiness, and against it too.* But here he lets the *Papists* alone, and turns his Pen chiefly against the maintainers of Justification by Faith alone, and those that hope to be justified by the Application of Christ's Merits to themselves: And is very angry with some modern Authours, for using the Expressions, of application of Christ to our selves, the *Hand of Faith*, imputed Righteousness, &c.

There is no intimation, says he, of any such Doctrine as this in the Scriptures, but it was invented by false Apostles. This is a bold Charge, in good truth; and if the Authour's Arguments were as good as his Confidence, he would make something of it. But instead of Argument he gives us nothing but a simple Parable about a Physician and his *Nosstrum*; which as it proves nothing, so 'tis not worth reciting. As to Justification by Faith alone, I hope I have made that Point good, in Answer to the second Chapter, and there too we shewed how the Doctrine of our relying on Christ's Merits, for our Justification, was founded on Scripture. I know not how some Men may abuse this Doctrine, by talking so much of, and insuing such Notions of Christ's imputed Righteousness into their Disciples; as to exclude all good Works of their own, and to make them take little Care, what Wickedness they do themselves, if they have but Confidence enough to think they shall be saved by Christ's Righteousness. This is a wretched Abuse of a good and comfortable Doctrine; but after all, 'tis by Faith, and not by Works we are justified: 'tis Christ's Infinite Merits that God does accept as the true meritorious Cause of our Justification, and 'tis Faith only can apply these Merits to our selves; I say apply these Merits to our selves: for these terms of applying and taking hold of Christ's Merits are not only to be met with in *Calvin* and *Amesius*, &c. but in several of the greatest Men of Antiquity. But to consider a little who those Persons are, which the Authour thus entitles with the Name of false Prophets. And truly these false Prophets are no less Persons than *St. Chrysostom*, *St. Basil*, *Theophylact*, *Oecumenius*, with several others of the *Latin Church*. \* *St. Chrysostom*, in \* Οὐκ ἔστι  
his second Homily upon the *Romans*, on these words of *St. Paul*, *I thank* πρὸς θεὸν  
my God, &c. He does not say, *I thank God*, but, *I thank my God*, who, as the ἁλλὰ, πρὸς  
θεὸν μὲν. Ο  
Chr. 2 Hom. Rom.  
Prophets,

*Prophets, makes that proper to himself, which is common to all. And so on the words of St. Paul, who hath loved me, &c. he thus comments. What say you, O blessed Paul? You said just before who spared not his own Son, now you say who loved me* ὁ ἰδιουοὶν καρπὸν ἐμεγαλύνει, *and apply to your self,*

*or make your own the common benefit. Id. Hom. 34. in Gen. St. † Basil* † Τὸς Θεοῦ Δικαιοσύνην ἀνέσκει, ἡμεῖς Δικαιοσύνης μετὰ λαβεῖν διὰ πίστεως, ὁ ἔστιν τὸ πᾶν, *says, 'Tis the Son of God that is Righteousness, and that we are righteous, by change of his Righteousness for ours. If you desire to attain Righteousness, & χάριτι λαβεῖν διὰ πίστεως, ὁ ἔστιν τὸ πᾶν, lay but hold upon Christ by Faith, and you shall have all. Now if these great Men must be branded with the Name of false Prophets, for asserting that we are justified by applying God's Promises to our selves, by Faith; by || taking hold on Christ for Righteousness, that we are justified by a μετὰ λαβεῖν of his Righteousness. I know not who in God's Church were true Pastours, for I think very few, if any, have bore a greater Character than these.*

*|| Vid. Hom. of Salvation, of the Pass, where are used the Terms of embracing and taking hold of Christ's Merits.*

His third Charge is, *That we advance Faith above Charity. If he means by this [we] the Church of England, he has answered himself a page or two further; where he says, \* She is the best constituted Church in the World, because in her departure from the Church of Rome she departed not from Charity. But besides, we extend our Charity as far as we can with our Duty; we make the Terms of Salvation as large as the Gospel allows them; but we must not, with our Charity, make other Terms of Salvation, than what our Saviour has done: We may hope, and have a charitable Opinion that a Man does perform these Conditions of Salvation; but we can never hope that a Man can be saved without them. We hope that such a one has repented, and is therefore saved; but 'tis unreasonable to hope he can be saved without Repentance. Now Faith is as much necessary to Salvation as Repentance; and therefore we cannot hope that any one can be saved, without such a Faith as the Gospel does require. What God may do by dispensing with his own Laws is nothing to us; but 'tis his revealed Will that is to govern our Thoughts and Actions, and not his hidden and unrevealed one, which we know nothing at all of. And thus much I have to say, as to the Charity of our Thoughts to Hereticks. As to the Charity of our Actions; we are to allow them all the courteous treatment that the Laws of the Church and Realm will allow, and to converse with them, if occasion require, so far as to avoid Scandal and Contagion. We ought not, to be sure, to make a bosom-Friend of a Heretick, when St. Paul bids us to reject him: we are to do him any good turn we can; but he has no Right to our ordinary*

\* Pag. ult.

dinary Conversation, as other good Christians have, till he returns again to the Catholick Faith. The Ancient \* Writers tell us, That St. John the Evangelist, when he

entered into a Bath where the Heretick Corinthus was, he hastened out again, and desired his Friends to do the like, least the Bath should fall upon them, whilst such a wicked Heretick was there. The Apostolick Canons prohibit all Communion with them †, and the Council of Laodicea || forbids to pray with them, or to \* contract Marriage with them; and certainly Heresie, in this Age, is not grown more Innocent than it was then, to deserve our Charity so much the more. As to the punishing of Hereticks, which the Authour makes another Breach of Charity against them; whatever the Romanists do, our Church contents her self with Punishment purely Spiritual, and leaves all the other to the Secular Power: Or to speak in the words of Photius,

† We are taught to cut off Hereticks from the Body of Christians, but otherwise to punish them we have not learned; but when they grow incorrigible we deliver them over to the Civil Power, that sentence may be passed on them by the Magistrates. Neither is our Secular Power in the least to be taxed with Severity now, the Act de Heretico comburendo, to the Authour's comfort, has now for some time been repealed, or else perhaps,

\* Iren. lib. 3. cap. 3. Euseb. Hist. lib. 4. cap. 14. Theod. Her. Fab. lib. 2. cap. 3.

† Can. Apost.

|| Can. 45, 46, &c.

\* Οὐ δὲ Ἀπηνλικὸς ἡ Σχισματικὸς συνευχέσθαι. Conc. Laod. Can. 33. id. Can. 30.

† Ἐκκλῆσιαν τῷ σώματι ὅτι Χριστιανῶν τὸς Ἀπηνλικούς ἐκ ἐκκλησίας, ἀλλὰ ἀμειψάτους ἵστας παραδίδεται τῷ Πολιτικῷ νόμῳ ὡς παρὰ τῶν Ἀρχιερέων τὰς περὶ τούτων ἀποφάσεις ἐκφράζει. Phot. in Nomocan. Tit. 9.

— tadā lucret in illā  
Quā stant ardens —

and might as deservedly, it may be, have followed his Friends || Gen- || Servetus was burnt for Blasphemy against the Holy Trinity at Geneva, by the Advice and Desire

likewise of the Switz-Cantons, An. Dom. 1553. And Valentinus Gentilis was executed for the same at Berne, An. Dom. 1558.

Fourthly, His next charge of Innovations upon us, is, That we advance Faith above Reason, and against it. But here is not a word of the Proof of this. He tells us indeed that we must not believe God's word any further than we have reason to believe it is God's word; and that it is unreasonable to believe a Mystery; and that is all

he says to this Point. 1. Now, as to the Believing in God's word, we never say, but that our Belief is grounded upon better Reason than that of the *Anti-trinitarians* is, for all their great pretence to it; and I am sure our Arguments, from Scripture, are a thousand times more rationally deduced than our Adversaries are; and as to Antiquity, they have not the least pretence to that. 'Indeed we do not pretend to understand all that our Reason tells us we ought to believe; and I think it is more reasonable to think we should not understand God's Nature, than that we should. 2. As to our believing a Mystery, that is not less to be believed upon that account, if we are sure it is true; for we do not believe it because it is a Mystery, but because it is a Truth, Well, but he says, this word Mystery has not the same sense in the Scripture, and other ancient Authours as we put upon it. As to the use of this word among prophane Authours, they understand by it, a Truth, which is known only to some few Men, and is not further to be divulged. And so principally the Rites of *Ceres* and *Proserpine* were called Mysteries, because they were esteemed to be of so great Sacredness, as in no ways to be revealed. And therefore \* *Suidas*

\* *Suid.* in verb. *μυσ.* *Μυστήρια ἐκ λήθους καὶ τὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων μὴν τὸ εἶναι, καὶ μὴ τὰ ταῦτα ἐκφραζέσθαι. Μὴν δὲ ἐστὶ τὸ κρύβειν.*

But then, by Analogy, all other things that were kept secret were called Mysteries. So *Tully*, speaking of his Letters, says,

† *Quia tantum habent Mysteriorum ut ne Librarius quidem committimus.* Cic. Ep. At. 1. 3. † which have so much of Mysteries in them, that I ought not to trust them to my Amanuenses. And in the holy Scripture there are other senses of the word than what the Authour mentions; for every thing that is called a Mystery there, is not a spiritual Truth wrapped up in a sensible, nor yet only a Truth hidden from some Ages; which two senses only the Authour will allow. For sometimes a thing altogether incomprehensible, as the Trinity is, is called a Mystery. 1 *Tim.* 3. 16. Without controversy great is the Mystery of Godliness; God manifest in the flesh, &c. Where the incomprehensible Truth of Christ's Incarnation is called a great Mystery. And therefore says an ancient Father admirably well, || *Great is the Mystery of Godliness; not that it is unknown, but because it is incomprehensible; for it exceeds all power both of Expression and of Understanding.*

|| *Μεγάλη τὸ ἴδιον ἐστὶν μυστήριον ὅτι ὡς ἀνομήνους πάντας, ἀλλ' ὡς ἰδιούθους πάντας καὶ ἐκείνους καὶ λόγους καὶ ὡς καθήκοντες.* I. Iodorus. Pelus. Ep. 192.

This perhaps the Apostle calls a great Mystery, in allusion to the Ceremonies of those Deities, that were called *Great*, far inconsiderable Mysteries in respect of this. Thus *Dianna* who was worshipped

with these Mysterial Rites, is called *μυστήρια Ἀρτεμις*, *Act.* 19. 27. and *Proserpine*.



*Proserpine and Ceres*, that were worshipped with the *Eleusinian Mysteries*, were stiled *μυστήρια Θεῶν*, and their Rites *μυστήρια μυστήρια*, *Athen*. Now, whereas these Mysteries and Deities were great only by their not being discovered; this Mystery of our Saviour, in a more peculiar manner, is great, by its being incomprehensible. Now the definition on which St. Chrysostom gives of a Mystery, takes in all these notions of the Word, \* *A Mystery is that which is unknown and secret, and has also a great deal wonderful in it, and a great deal incomprehensible*. But the Authour says 'tis more than a hidden Mystery, that is, in his phrase, a plain contradiction, that the same thing should be hid and open to the same Persons; and who denies it, if he mean in the same respect? But a thing may be hid in one respect, and open in another: 'Tis open and reveal'd to us, That our Saviour's Divinity is, *de facto*, united to his Humanity; but the express *modus* how this Union is performed is hid to us. That Father, Son, and Holy-Ghost are one God, is revealed or open to us, but the manner of their Hypostatical Union is altogether hid. That these things are so, is plain and open to us; but how they are so is altogether unintelligible. And this I think is no Contradiction.

\* *Mysteria*  
ἐν ἑστὶ τὸ  
ἀγνοούμεν-  
ον καὶ ἀποκ-  
ρυφτόν, καὶ  
πολλὸν ἰσχυ-  
ρὸν θαύμα.  
πολλὸν ὃ  
παρὰ τὸ  
εἶναι ἑχόν.  
Chryf.  
Hom. 19.  
in Rom.

### ENQUIRY. III.

*What Damages or Advantages have ensued upon the Changes and Additions which latter Ages have made in the Gospel.*

Here need little be said to this Chapter, because I hope I have made it, in some measure, appear, That the Doctrine of the Trinity, and particularly of the Divinity of our Saviour, is no Addition made to the Gospel; but is that which was first delivered by our Saviour and his Apostles: and therefore this Supposition of the Authour's being false, whatever Conclusions he draws from it, without any more ado, will fall of themselves. But because he has before reckoned the Doctrine of the Trinity among the Papal Corruptions, or, as he speaks, the *Athanasian among the Romish Doctrines*; and, by the Tenour of his whole Book, has been proving this Doctrine an Innovation, though he do not particularly mention it here, but only Innovations in general: I shall therefore follow him in his Method, and shew, That this Doctrine has in no ways occasioned those Damages and Corruptions in the Church, which he would seem to lay to its charge;

charge; and which 'tis apparent those Papal Doctrines he mentions have.

He tells us there have ensued upon these Changes and Additions, I. Damages. II. Advantages. The Damages which have ensued he says are. 1. To our Lord's honour. 2. To private Christians. 3. To the Christian Church in general.

The Damages which he would have to proceed from these Innovations to our Lord's honour. First, Because they make him Capricious and humourfome, by commanding things to be believed without reason. Secondly, Because they hinder the progress of the Gospel.

Now how far the Romish Corruptions deserve this censure, I shall not examine; but I am afraid the Authour will have a difficult task to prove this upon the Orthodox Doctrine of the Trinity, or the Divinity of our blessed Saviour. I have before shewn, how unreasonable it is to expect we should be able to give an account of the true Reason of all God's positive Laws, and how impudent it is for Men to refuse their Obedience to them, because they do not understand those motives, that inclined his Eternal Wisdom to command them. It no ways follows, that he is a humourfome or capricious Being, because we do not understand the Reason of his Commands; because he may have reasons that lie far beyond the fathom of our finite understandings. A wise Statesman, or a Mathematician, is not therefore capricious and humourfome, because he does several things which the ignorant Spectator can give no account of. And certainly God may have commanded us several things for our belief, which we cannot imagine how they should any ways conduce to our good and happiness, ye he himself may know it, as his Providence does several things for our benefit, by means to us seemingly contrary. But besides we have proved, that the Doctrine of our Saviour's Divinity is an admirable motive to our Piety, and it were as easy to do the same, if it were not too long here, as to the Divinity of the holy Spirit. So that it is so far from Capriciousness, that it shews the inexpressible Wisdom of the Deity, that every person of the Blessed Trinity should be particularly concerned in the Salvation of Mens Souls in our Creation, Redemption and Sanctification, and each of them should lay the strictest obligation upon us to Piety. 2. Neither does the Doctrine of the Trinity hinder the progress of the Gospel, though the Romish Doctrines may. The Idolatry of that Church is an Eternal Bar to Jews and Mahometans, but the Doctrine of the Trinity is not such. We worship one God as well as they, and acknowledge only in that unity of essence, a Trinity of Persons, which was a truth the Ancient Jews had something of a notion of in their Doctrine of the *Logos*, or Word,

as appears from their Rabbins, and other Writers; nor can we suppose, that the Mahometans should so stand out against this Truth, unless they had been prejudiced against it by their false Prophet, whose Interest it was to have it denied. But when ever it shall please God to call home the Jews, and to bring in the fullness of the Gentiles, this Truth will be no obstacle to it, this Divine Mystery shall be believed in, and adored, when all the Romish Hay and Stubble shall be burnt up.

2. He makes the Damages which have proceeded from Innovations, pernicious to private Christians. First, By hindring Godliness. Secondly, Inward Joy and Tranquillity of Mind. Now we have proved often enough, that the Orthodox Doctrine is so far from hindering Piety, that it does extraordinarily improve it. If there happen what the Authour mentions, too much eager disputing about it, then the fault is not in the Doctrine, but in the undue managing of it; if Men have taken more care to contend for the Faith, than against their Lusts, and endeavoured more to confound Hereticks, than to obey God's Commands; they are to answer for that themselves, but their faults are not to be charged upon this Doctrine. So secondly, If the Joy and Tranquillity of the Church has been disturbed by the defending of this Doctrine, that is a thing purely accidental to it, it does not make it less true, because it has cost the Orthodox so much pains to vindicate its Truth against the Fraud and Violence of so many Hereticks. Whatever damages good Men have suffered in this Controversy, that is, to be charged upon those wicked Hereticks that have denied this Doctrine, and not upon the Doctrine it self, or the Defenders of it.

Thirdly, He makes these Innovations prejudicial to the Church of Christ in its general Capacity. But in the proof of this, he only tells us some stories of the Slaughter of the *Albigenses*, and *Waldenses*, and the Cruelty of the Duke D' *Alva*, &c. which have no relation at all to the Doctrine of the Trinity. He cannot say, that the Orthodox, in the Primitive Times, butchered the Hereticks, as the Papists have done the Protestants, and therefore the Orthodox Doctrine has nothing to answer for upon this Account.

II. He then proceeds to shew the Advantages which have accrued by the Changes which latter Ages have made in the Gospel. But here is nothing offered, as to the Doctrine of the Trinity, nor which can any ways conclude against this, and therefore I shall spare my self and my Reader, the trouble of saying much to this Paragraph. He tells us here a great deal of the Pope's Merchandise, and by the honour and power which he has got, by pretending to be Christ's Vicar, and brings

brings some sayings from the Papists, that the Pope is as much better than the Emperour, as the Sun than the Moon; that a Priest is as much better than a King, as a Man than a Beast; that Catholick Kings are Asses with Belts, &c. with some other proofs of the Roman Clergies aggrandizing themselves by their Doctrines; which would have done well enough in a Controversy in the late Reign, but are something impertinent in a Book designed against the Trinity. But what though the Popish Doctrines of Pardons and Indulgences, Merits, &c. have for so many years kept up the Apostolick Chamber, though the Doctrine of Purgatory has gained them so many stately Monasteries, tho' the pretended Supremacy and Infallibility of the Pope has raised his Authority so high, though Transubstantiation and the being able, as they sometimes blasphemously call it, to make a God, has raised the esteem of their Priests among the People; yet the Doctrine of the ever Blessed Trinity, never brought any advantage to the Clergy, and therefore this can never be justly censured upon this Account, as a humane Invention, and the product of Priestcraft, as those others justly are.

## The Conclusion.

**A**ND here the Authour says, *the end of all*, what he has been saying, I suppose he means, *is to determine between Faith and Love, to give unto Faith the things that are Faiths, and unto Love the things that are Loves.* But I wish he had made his words good throughout his Book, for that had saved me all this trouble, and the World all the mischief that his Book has done. As to Love he has not said much to that, but as for Faith, he has given so little to that, that granting his Principles, it would be hard to find such a Christian Vertue in the World. For all that belongs to Faith he has given to Reason, and what would not go down with his Reason, he is resolved shall neither belong to Faith nor Reason, but shall pass for downright contradiction. But now at last for a parting blow, to shew how little Faith is to be esteemed, especially in respect of Love, he brings the Opinion of our own Church, that in her Offices of Baptism and Visitation of the sick, *declareth, that our Faith is not to extend beyond the simplest of the Creeds, and therefore if she says any thing elsewhere, that seems to contradict this, it is her Charity, in becoming a Papist to the Papist; that by all means she might gain some of the Papists.* Of the admirable Charity of



of our Church, I am very well convinced of, but I never heard of her Hypocrisy before, or at least to have it commended too. And truly if what our Authour would make us believe, be true, that she entertains the *Athanasian* and *Nicene* Creeds, only in compliance to the Papists, when in reality she disbelieves them, she is guilty of the most abominable Hypocrisy in the World. 'Tis true indeed, she uses the Apostles Creed only in those Offices he speaks of, because they are the most ancient, and the shortest, and therefore the fittest for these occasions; but yet by the words of the Apostles she understands the substance of what is contained in the other, which she looks upon as Comments upon this. But however, to be sure her use of it in those Offices, does not shew her to disbelieve the other Creeds any more, than the use of the *Athanasian* or *Nicene* in the other Offices of the Prayer-Book shews, that she disbelieves the Apostles. One would have thought that her using all three, did shew her belief of all three, for that I am sure is the more natural consequence, and not that her using one in one place, does shew that she does not believe the other two she uses in other places. Well, but this may be in compliance with the Papists that she uses them. But how does he prove that? Has he any contest, that the Compilers of the Common-Prayer designed any such thing? Do the Rubricks, Canons, Articles, or any other Publick Authority of the Church say any thing like it? Till the Authour could have found some such grounds to have gone upon, he had better have kept his foolish surmise to himself, and not so senselessly have taxed the best Church in the World with such a wicked compliance. But what more ample satisfaction could our Church have given to the World, of her believing these two Creeds, and the Injunction of the same to all her Members, than by what she has done? She recommends all the three Creeds in her Articles, and tells us, \* they ought *\* Eccl. Ang.* thoroughly to be believed: for they may be proved by most certain warrants, *Artic. 8.* from holy Scripture. In her Rubricks she has ordered the *Athanasian* Creed to be used upon all the great Festivals of the year instead of the Apostles, by which it is plain, she looks upon it, at least, an Equivalent to it. And this is to be said by the Minister, not as something Declaratory to the People, but as something they do assent to, and in his words do they openly profess; as appears by the Rubricks, ordering the People to stand at this Creed, as at the Apostles, which is a token of their assenting to, and of their making an open profession of what is then read. Now can we suppose, that the Church should exact so solemn a profession of the Faith contained in this Creed, upon these great days, if she did not expect they should believe what they so solemnly profess? If the Authour can believe this, he should

never tax the Orthodox again with the Absurdity of their Faith. The *Nicene Creed* is ordered to be said every Sunday and Holiday, and in the Communion Service just before the receiving the Blessed Sacrament, if a Sermon does not intervene, in the same manner the other Creeds are recited. And can we suppose that the Church should oblige her Members to make such an Hypocritical Confession, at a time when she supposes them to have the best thoughts, and the most pious Resolutions, and to seal this their Hypocrisy with no less than immediate Perjury? If she did do this, instead of being the best, she would be the most wicked Church in the World, this one Injunction would serve to set against forty Romish corruptions; but in truth the Romanists had never Forehead enough to object this against her, so that it seems the Hereticks, upon occasion, can outdo the Jesuits in this qualification; for this Authour, by this one Calumny against the Church, has said enough to silence all the lying Slanders of the Jesuits, down from *Sanders* and *Parsons*, to the little Scriblers in the late Reign. As to his saying (speaking of the Convocation last year) *that it will be a great disappointment to his Majesty, and his good People, if such an opportunity prove fruitless*, I cannot so well understand what he means; if he means fruitless towards the discouraging his Opinions, or for the taking away of these Creeds; I believe it was more than his Majesty, or any of his good People ever thought of, or would have been satisfied with, if it had been done; nor could any but the Authour be so simple to imagine, that when the State, so lately, by an Act of Parliament, had excluded the Anti-Trinitarians, even from the Benefit of Toleration, that they should be let into the Church by an Act of Convocation.

THE END.

SOME

# SOME REFLECTIONS

UPON THE

## Naked Gospel.

As it is last

Published and Owned,

By D<sup>r</sup> BURY.

**S**INCE these Papers were in the Licensers hands, the Bookseller told me, it would be expected, I should say something to the Book Dr. Bury has since Published, under his name; so much altered from what it was before. I do not think this is absolutely necessary to do in point of justice to the Authour; for I have not concerned my self at all, who was the Authour of that Book: I only took care to Answer the False and Heretical Doctrines I found there, which were like to do any mischief in the World, which might still do harm enough, for all its Authour's retraction. It is his first Book that requires an Answer, and not this last; for that is such a poor Toothless Adder, the poison of which is so much drained out, that we may venture it any where without an Antidote: Indeed 'tis easy still to discern here the Tracts of the Heresy in his former Book, but now they appear so thin and discoloured, that the Reader, whose gust lies the Socinian way, will throw aside this insipid Heterodoxy, for something of the same kind that is more substantial. Here is still, for the most part, the old Heretical Body, with here and there an

Orthodox Limb; so that his Book looks now like one of our old Saxon Idols, half Man, and half Monster. Now whatever of his Erroneous Opinions he has altered, or retracted in this last Book, I shall not concern my self with them at all; and truly, I am glad he is come to own them to be such; I shall only make a transient Remark or two upon those places in this Edition, where instead of recanting, he has multiplied his Heterodoxies.

But by the way, it will be worth while a little to consider the Apology, the Doctor makes for his first Book, in his Preface to this. He says this was drawn up against the sitting of the late Convocation, at a time he had not patience to be silent in, to enlarge some of their minds with a more comprehensive Charity, with an intention to communicate what he had wrote to the members of that Convocation, and therefore he penned it with less caution, than was necessary for what was to be exposed to every vulgar Eye. Now is not this a pretty excuse after so long hammering out? The Doctor writes a Socinian Book, wherein he condemns the belief of nineteen parts in twenty of all the Christians in the World, only to enlarge the minds of the Convocation with a more comprehensive Charity. This would have been a pretty piece of comprehensive Charity indeed, to have damned all the Members of the Catholick Church for so many Ages, for worshipping a Creature for God, out of pure tenderness to Socinian Consciences. Well, but he penned it with less caution than if it had been to be exposed to every vulgar Eye. Now I should have thought it had been requisite to be more exact in composing what was to be viewed by the more judicious; and that it had been a little too presuming to offer a parcel of uncorrected stuff to so learned an Assembly. I am sure 'tis but a course Complement of the Author's to those learned Gentlemen, to write what was to be read by them at that rate, as he would not care should be view'd by every vulgar Eye. But though we should let this Excuse pass for some of his uncouth Expressions, or little slips in his Quotations and Chronologies, &c. I am afraid it will never bear him out for all the premeditated Heresy of his Book. Though he be ready to own, that there are some scattering *Sphulmaria* in that Treatise, yet I believe he would be loth to have it thought one Total and Uniform *Erratum*. Are all his Chapters about the Socinian Notions of Faith nothing but slips in the penning? Are so many Arguments against our Saviour's eternal Generation nothing else? Are all his scandalous Reflections upon the Doctrine of the Trinity and the Assertors of it, his malicious Censures upon so many good and holy Counsels only owing to the want of a little caution in the writing? If this be so, 'tis impossible to know any Author's mistakes from his general Design; for if it was not the Doctor's



ctor's design to invalidate the Truth of Christ's Divinity, he designed nothing at all; for there is not one Chapter in his whole Book, but some how or other, tends that way. But he designed, he says, only to communicate his Book to the Members of the Convocation; this is a very fine excuse indeed, to make that venerable Body, whose business it was to detect and condemn all Heresies, to become Patrons to his; but however, this is but an usual piece of *Socinian* Confidence, not unlike that of the Editor of the *Racovian* Catechism, who dared to dedicate so Heretical a piece to so Orthodox a Member of the Church, as King *James* the First. But, why this to the Convocation? Whom of his stamp did he find there, that he could dare to communicate such a Book to? This is such an infamous scandal to those great Representatives of our Church, that he can never atone for; to presume that ever they would steer their Actions by the direction of such an Heretical Treatise as that. What would a Foreigner upon reading this Plea be apt to think of the Members of that August Assembly, that the Doctor should design that Book for their use, which the University as soon as detected, condemned to the Fire? But after all, What constat is there that he designed this to be handed only to those Members? Which by the way can be no excuse neither; for such a private handing to all the Members of such a publick Body gathered from all the different parts of the Nation is as effectual a spreading of his Heresy as any publication whatsoever. But I say, What constat is there that he designed only this? Why, truly none at all, but only his saying so; and how far his word will go in this matter, I cannot tell. 'Tis plain, the Copies of his Book were not essayed to be spread, till the *Lent* after the Convocation was broke up. The Gentlemen in *Oxford* to whom he delivered Copies were not all Members of that Body; and the 500 which \* *Litchfield* in his Deposition said he printed, were more far than the number of which the Convocation did consist. Those Copies which were sent to the *Bookseller*, and afterwards upon the dislike of the Book recalled, were not I presume all designed to be sold to Convocation Men. Nay, if the good Providence of God and the watchful Care of some of our excellent Governours in the University had not interposed, we might have had every young Lad in the University to have gotten one of these wicked Books into his Study. So that 'tis ridiculous evasion, for the Author to say in the Title page of this Edition, that the Book is now first published by him; for he published it, as much as he could, before he put the Copies of it into the Publishers hands, which was all he could do for his part; and that they were stopped there, was owing to the Intervention of other Authority. And so much for the Doctor's excuses; to pass by his fancy Treating

\* *Litchfield*, the  
Printers  
Deposition  
in the  
Account  
of *Gr. Exeter*  
Coll. &c.

of the late Convocation by the reproachful names of Uncharitable, Stubborn, Stiff, &c. which is such *Billingsgate* stuff, as is like calling Whore first; to fasten those ill names upon them to avoid, if he can, the deserved one of Heretick upon himself. No. 84

\* Chap. 7.  
of the New  
Edition.

I now come to speak a word or two to the Errors of this New Edition: And those I think mostly lie within his \* Chapter of the Trinity, which is the only New one in his Book; for all his others are but the old Heresy pared away, and something better varnished over than before. And indeed in this Chapter there is something New, for there is such an explication of the Trinity, as no mortal ever heard before. Here is a mixture of *Platonism*, *Hobbiism* and *Sabellianism*, with some other peculiar Notions of the Doctor's own, jumbled together.

*Quantum mutatus ab illo!* Is this the Author that has been declaiming so much against Mysteries, and the explaining of Mysteries, and has at last stuffed us out a Chapter with so much mystical jargon? But after all, this second Notion of the Doctor's is no farther distant from *Socinianism*, than a Trinominal Deity is different from him that is personally one, without such nominal Distinction; or just so much as the Doctrine of *Sabellius* differed from that of *Sameſeeanus* or *Photinus*. Now the first thing that the Doctor does to advance this Notion, is to be angry with the terms *ὁusia* and *ὑποστασις*, Substance and Person. He says, *it was proposed in the Council of Alexandria, That all Persons should forbear those Terms;* tho' I do not find any such thing was proposed there. There were indeed some Rules given for caution in using them; because they said the word *ὁusia* was not used in Scripture; and the Apostle used the word *ὑποστασις*, ἐν τῇ τῶν θεοῦ μαρτυρίᾳ ἀνάγκῃ upon necessity of his matter; but otherways, they decreed that these words were to be admitted because they do explode the Opinion of *Sabellius*; that we may not through want of words call God under three Names, but that every Name of the Trinity should signify God under a distinct or proper Person *in idia ὑποστάσει*. And what other use do we desire to make of them than this?

¶ Soc. lib.  
3. cap. 5.

\* ἄρον πῖ-  
ταυς ἐξέ-  
θελο ἀθε-  
ον φύσιν ἡ  
ὑστάτ' ἐπὶ  
θεῷ λέ-  
γειν ἀπα-  
γορεύοντα  
Libel. Syn  
Theod. Hi

## stance



Next the Doctor sets to work to his exposition of the Trinity, which because he will not have it be mysterious, he is resolved to have it demonstrable by the Light of Nature; for he says, *the Light of Nature doth demonstrate what St. John affirmeth, There are Three Persons that bear witness, &c.* There are a great many in the world that the Doctor would oblige with a little of this Demonstration; but whatever we may expect from him hereafter, since this wonderful Illumination; I am sure, what he has given us in this Chapter, is far enough from it. He tells us, That the Three Persons in the Trinity are *Mind, Reason, and Power*; the *Reason*, or the *Logos* is begotten or conceived of the *Mind*, the *Father*, both which are imperfect, unless perfected by *Power*, or *Action*, which is the *Holy-Ghost*. Now, is this the Explication that agrees to a Syllable, both to the *Holy Scripture*, and the *Church of England*? is this the putting the old *Materials* into a new and better *Frame*, which he so boasts of? They are old *Materials* indeed, as old as *Sabellism* and the other Hereticks of his stamp, but neither older nor newer than their Heresies. For, I pray, what difference is there between *Sabellism's* Explication of the Trinity and the Doctor's? The \* *Sabellians* taught, That the *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy-Ghost* were the same; so that there were *Three Names* in *One Person*; and as in a *Man* there is *Body*, *Soul*, and *Spirit* or *Mind*, σώμα, ψυχή, & πνεῦμα. So the *Body* is, as it were, the *Father*; the *Soul*, the *Son*; and that which is the *Spirit* in *Man*, is the *Holy-Ghost* in the *Deity*. All the Difference between these two Notions of the Trinity, is, That *Sabellism's* inclines a little more to the *Epicurean*, and the Doctor's to the *Platonick Philosophy*; but both of them are far enough from Truth and Scripture. Nay, the Doctor's Explication is the more *Sabellian* of the two, because his Distinction of the Persons is the more nominal; for *Body*, *Soul*, and *Spirit*, are more distinct than *Mind*, *Reason*, and *Operation*. So that by striving to avoid *Sabellianism*, as he pretends, he has out-done *Sabellism* himself in his own Heresie. But, after all, what can we make of our Author's Trinity, which any *Unitarian* will not agree to! *Mind*, *Reason*, and *Action*—why, are not all these in every *Man*, and every rational Being, as well as in *God*; and I hope he will not make as many Trinities as there are intelligent Beings. Besides, *Mind*, *Reason*, and *Energy* or *Action*, are but divers *Modus* of the same thing. *Mind*, is the rational Principle, simply considered; *Reason*, is the same *Soul*, considered Discursive or Reasoning; and *Action* or *Energy*, is the *Soul* putting the determination of such Reasoning into act: but still these are but distinct *Modus's* of the same *Soul*. But what are these to Three distinct Persons in one Essence? There every Person is, by a proper personal difference, distinguished from

\* Σαβελ-  
λίου &  
αὐτοῦ ἐν  
ἐκ. Epiph.  
Hær. 62.



from each other, not by any particular modality, but by a true and real subsistence. But when the Doctor makes the Son to be only Reason, he can only make him an accident, or at best but a Modality of the Father. For if he only be the λόγος περιουσίας, or what answers to it, the internal Conception of the Father's Mind, he would be only an Accident, or Attribute, or Mode, or what else you'll please to call it, but would be far enough from that which the Church has all along called a Person. And therefore the learned Fathers in the Church have been always careful, to distinguish between this \* λόγος περιουσίας, and the λόγος οὐσιώδους, between the prolative, or enunciative word, and the essential and substantial one. For the Son is not therefore called the word, because he is the Reason of the Divine Mind, or the Father, but because he is generated of the Father † without Passion. For they explained this Generation by the production of a thought or word, which was not produced by || division or separation of parts, which implies Passion; but in a certain manner incommunicable to all Corporeal Beings.

οὐσιώδους λόγος. Theod. Therap. Ser. II. So Athanasius calls the Son ἐνόντιον λόγον. Athan. de def. Tom. 2. Ed. Par. p. 53. Vid. Dam. Orth. Fid. Lib. 1. Cap. 18. † Λόγος λόγους διὰ τὸ ἀπὸ συνδυασμῶν καὶ ἀπαθῶς γεννηθῆναι. Dam. Orth. fid. Lib. 1. Cap. 9. Ὁ λόγος δηλοῖ τὸ ἀπαθὲς γέννησιν. Theod. Ep. Div. Doctr. Cap. 2. Διὰ τί λόγος; ὅτι ἀπαθῶς ἐγενήθη. Bal. Mag. in 1. Joh. Λέγει αὐτὸν λόγον, ἵνα τὸ ἀπαθὲς παρρησίᾳ καὶ γνησίως. Chrys. Hom. 116. Id. in Psal. 45. || See this at large in St. Chrysostom's 116. Hom. Tom. 5. p. 747.

So when the Doctor makes the Holy Ghost to be only the Power, or Energy, or Action of God, what is this more than what the Socinians contend for, and the Samosetanians and Followers of Simon Magus were Condemned for? Nazianzen says, that \* the Simonians thought the Holy Spirit was only an Energy; and Leontius tells us, † that Paulus Samosetanus held the like. Besides, if the Holy Ghost be only an action, with what propriety of speech can he be said to act or do? With what tolerable sense can an action be said to speak? and the Spirit said unto Peter, Act. 10. 20. The Holy Ghost said unto them at Antioch, Act. 13. How can an action or energy be said to search all things, to make intercession for us, to divide to every man severally as he will, to reprove the World, to guide us into all truth? 'Tis the nature of an Action || to be acted, but it can in no propriety be said it self to act. || So The. But the Doctor says, this Doctrine is stated by the \* Fathers, as he says in 1 has done it. I hope, by his Fathers, he does not mean such as the Ministers of Alba Julia † call so, the famous Fathers Berillus, Samosetanus, Photinus, &c. and indeed some of these we have shewn to have

Ὁὐκ ἐνεργῆσαι ἀλλ' ἐνεργῆσθαι καὶ ὁ παῖς. So Nazianz. Or. 37. \* Εἰ ἐνεργῶν ἐνεργησῆσαι δηλονότι οὐκ ἐνεργῆσαι. \* P. 50. † See the History of Socinianism which follows.

explained the Trinity something at this rate, but none of the Orthodox ones, that I know of, say any thing like it. But he says, *St. Austin, the Oracle of the Schoolmen*, states it thus, whom *Dr. Sherlock* follows, in his Book of the Trinity. I know *St. Austin* in his Books *de Trinitate* (if he means those) has a great many strange Platonick Notions, which I confess I do not understand, and which perhaps *St. Austin* himself had no clear conceptions of when he wrote them; but however there is enough in those Books to shew, that *St. Austin* never designed such a nominal distinction in the Trinity, as this Authour does. What *Dr. Sherlock* says on this matter, I have not time now to consult; though when I read his Book, I don't remember he gave any Countenance to this Opinion; nay, on the contrary, some have been displeased \* with that Learned Doctor, for making too great a distinction between the Persons of the Trinity; not for making them three Names, or *Modus*'s, as our Doctor does, but for making them three distinct Minds or Spirits, which are one by mutual Consciousness.

\* *Dr. Wallis's* Letters.

But what though these great Men should speak more nicely than ordinary of these Mysteries, though they should wade deeper into them than other men, The great Genius's of these admirable Persons, and the strength of their natural reason will help to bear them out; but I would advise our Authour to a little more cautionness; he poor Gentleman may be out of his depth before he is aware, and therefore I am sure 'tis his best way to keep within the ordinary Compass.

---

FINIS.

# A Short HISTORY OF SOCINIANISM.

**T**HE Heretical Persuasion of our Blessed Saviour's being only mere Man, and the consequent Doctrines which ensue thereupon, have, of late Years, been called *Socinianism*; from the two *Socinus's*, the most famous Inventors and Propagators of this Doctrine, in the last Age: for though the Heresie it self, as to some parts of it, was much older, yet it had been altogether unknown for many Ages, till by the Books of *Servet*, the *Socinus's*, and some other Hereticks in the last Age, it was revived.

The first that set up this damnable Doctrine, was the Heretick *Cerinthus*, who lived in the Apostolick times, and was Contemporary with St. John the Evangelist. He asserted, <sup>a</sup> That Jesus was mere Man as others were, <sup>1</sup> *Iren. lib. 1. cap. 15.* and that he did not excell the rest in Justice, or Wisdom, or Prudence. The Confutation of this Heresie <sup>b</sup> was a special motive to St. John to write his Gospel, or at least to be more expresse than the rest of the Evangelists, in asserting our Lord's Divinity. *Ebion*, the Scholar of *Cerinthus*, <sup>3. cap. 11.</sup> followed after his Master in this Heresie, and propagated his Doctrines in *Asia*, *Cyprus*, *Rome*, and elsewhere; he asserted, That Christ was but [*ἄνθρωπος ἀνθρώπων*] <sup>d</sup> pure Man, [*ἁπλῶς καὶ κοινῶς μόνον ἄνθρωπος*] <sup>e</sup> only common and mere Man. This Heresie, in the Second Age, was propagated by one *Theodotus Scythes*, or the Carrier, who taught likewise, That Christ was [*ἄνθρωπος ἀνθρώπων*] <sup>e</sup> mere Man; and was excommunicated by *Victor* Bishop of *Rome* <sup>f</sup> for this Blasphemy. <sup>1. Theophyl. Prolog. in Job. Epiph. Har. 30. Euseb. Eccl. Hist. lib. 4. cap. 21. Theod. Har. Fab. l. 2. c. 5.</sup> *Artemon* followed *Theodotus*, who said, <sup>g</sup> That Christ was mere Man, <sup>Phil. Ign. Ep.</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Euseb. Hist. Eccl. cap. ult. <sup>b</sup> Euseb. ib. Niceph. Hist. lib. 4. cap. 21. <sup>c</sup> Theod. Har. Fab. l. 2. c. 5. <sup>d</sup> only

only more excellent in Vertue or Power [*ἀγαστὴ*] than the Prophets. Against this *Artemon* there was a famous Book wrote, which <sup>b</sup> *Eusebius* mentions, in which it was proved, That the Ancient Christians did not believe his Doctrine as he pretended; and, in which the Authorities of *Iustin Martyr*, *Miltiades*, *Tatian*, *Clemens*, are brought to confute him. Sixty years after his Death, <sup>i</sup> in the Third Age, about the Year 270, *Paulus Samosetanus* disseminated this Doctrine; and asserted, <sup>k</sup> That *Christ* had only the common Nature of Man. He was condemned in the Council at *Antioch* 272. Much about this time, or somewhat before, *Sabellius* broached his Heresie, not much unlike the rest of these; he held, <sup>l</sup> That there was but One Person in the Deity, *τὸν ὁμοῦνον*, under Three Names, which does, in effect, (as <sup>1</sup> *St. Basil* says upon this account) deny *Christ's* Divinity. *Arius* who followed after, and made such a noise in the World with his Heresie, whatever his thoughts might be, yet he did not expressly assert *Christ* to be mere Man; but only to be a Creature produced in time; yet one that had a Being long before his conception in the Womb of the Virgin: and therefore he cannot so properly come into the List of these Hereticks. But soon after the *Nicene* Determinations against *Arius*, *Photinus*, one of the old *Cerinthian* Race, starts up, who was Bishop of *Sirmium*, and asserts again, That *Christ* was mere man, and <sup>m</sup> had no Being before the Ages, and, <sup>n</sup> That he, *ὁ μὲν Μωϋσῃς ἀφ' αἰῶνος*, had his sole Beginning from the time he was conceived in the Virgin's Womb.

These were the chief Propugnors of this Heresie in the Primitive times; there being none of any considerable note after these; for then almost all the Heresies ran into *Arianism*, *Nestorianism*, *Eutychianism*, &c. the prevailing Heresies of the succeeding Ages: And indeed this Heresie seemed to be quite lost, till *Petrus Abelandus*, in the Twelfth Century, did revive it. He, about the Year 1140, was a famous Philosopher and Divine, and Professor at *Paris*; he asserted <sup>o</sup> That he could comprehend the Godhead with humane Reason, totum id quod Deus est humanâ ratione comprehendere; and wrote such things of the Trinity, of the Generation of the Son, and the Procession of the Holy Ghost, and innumerable things of the like nature, as were unheard of, by Catholick Ears: he affirmed, <sup>p</sup> The Holy Ghost not to be of the Essence of the Father, and denied <sup>q</sup> Original Sin, and <sup>r</sup> the Satisfaction of *Christ*. Which are all the true Characteristicks of the Socinian Heresie.

<sup>s</sup> *Samson. Rhemensis Epist. in Liter. ad Pont. in Oper. Abelandi ad Car. p. 296.* <sup>t</sup> *S. Bern. Epist. ad Ep. & Card. Cur. Id. Ep. ad Innoc. Abel. Com. in Rom. 5. p. 597.* <sup>u</sup> *Bern. Ep. ad Innoc. Abel. in Rom. 3. 14.*

Servetus  
1530.

These were the most remarkable of this sort of Unitarian Hereticks till the time of the Reformation: and the first then that stood up for this



this Heterodoxy was *Michael Servetus a Spaniard*, by Profession a Physician, who having travelled into *Africa*, and being instructed in the Principles of *Mahometanism*, set up for the Unitarian Doctrine in *Europe*. He in the year 1531, published his Book, Entituled, *Lib. 7. de Error. Trinitatis*, which was printed at *Basil*. This Book was filled with innumerable Blasphemies and impious Mockeries upon the Holy Trinity; upon which account most of the Copies of it were soon after publicly burnt at *Frankford*. But notwithstanding this, they were privately handed about, so that many that were inclinable to a separation from the *Romish* Errours, were poisoned by this Book into worse. And therefore *Philip Melancthon* writes a Letter from *Lipsick*, 1539. to have the Senate of *Venice* put in mind of suppressing his Heresy. But *Servet* in the mean time uses all imaginable diligence, to disseminate his Doctrines; and to this end, goes from place to place practising Physick under the feigned name of *Michael Villonovanus*; when he wrote a Book of *Syrops*, and as *Munster* says, a Comment on *Ptolemies* Geography. He afterwards wrote some other Heretical Pieces alike blasphemous with the other; as one Entituled, *A Dialogue de Restitutione Christianismi*, quoted by *Bullinger*, an Apology to *Melancthon* and the Ministers of *Geneva*, *Calvin*, &c. in which Books *Calvin* in his Confutation, says, *plus centum*, &c. he more than a hundred times over, calls the Holy Trinity, the three headed *Cerberus*, a Diabolical Phantasm, the Monster *Gerion*, the illusion of *Satan*, &c. His Book of the *Restitution of Christianity*, which was a large Volume, he published at *Vienna Allobrogum*, where for the same, he was cast into Prison; but he escaped from thence to *Geneva*, where he was discovered, and afterwards condemned and burned in the year 1568. by the desire of the *Evangelick* Cantons.

The next follower of *Servetus*, and the fore-runner of *Socinus*, was *Valentinus Gentilis*, born at *Consenza* in *Italy*, who agreed with *Servetus* in his Doctrine, that the Father was the only Divine Essence; but asserted that the Son was essentiated by him, and made another God, as likewise the Holy Ghost: So that there were not three Persons in one Essence, but three distinct Essences in the God-head, or rather one Primary God, and two Secondary or Deified Ones. These Blasphemies he having for some time vented in the World, particularly at *Geneva*, he was by the Magistrates of that City thrown into Prison, where not having staid long, he of his own accord, promises amendment, recants his Errours; and desires to be freed. But the Magistrates resolved not to free him, unless he will undergo the Penance they prescribe him, which accordingly he did, *to be stripped to his Shirt, and barefooted and bareheaded to kneel down and beg pardon for his Crimes*, *Gentilis*.

This Wick-  
ed objects  
out of Lin-  
dunus, and  
Socinus in  
his Answer  
does not  
deny it.  
Vid. Socin.  
Anti-Wick-  
um cap. 1.  
Epist.  
Phil. Me-  
lan. Lib. 1.  
p. 335.

Valenti-  
nus Genti-  
lis.

Vid. Are-  
tj vit. Val.  
Crimes, Gentilis.

Crimes, and with his own hands to throw his *Heretical Writings* into the Fire, to be prepared for that purpose, and in this *Habit* to be led through all the Streets of the City, declaring his Repentance before all the People. This having performed, he petitions again for his enlargement, which would not yet be granted, unless he would swear not only to forbear the spreading of his Heresy, but that he would never go out of the City without leave from the Senate. And this too he readily did. But no sooner was he freed, but he little valuing his Oath, flies from Geneva to his Friend *Gribaldus*, living at a place called *Farges* in the Canton of *Bern*; where he had conference with *Alciat* a famous *Unitarian* in order to the spreading their Heresy. From thence he went to *Lyons* to diffuse his Doctrine there; from thence to *Grenoble*; from thence to *Cambray*, and so to *Farges* again; where the Governour of *Gais*, to whose Jurisdiction *Farges* does belong, imprisons him again; but upon promise of living quietly, releases him. From thence he goes again to *Lyons*, and was there imprisoned a third time by the Governour of that City; but he perswading the Papists there, that his Controversy was only against *Calvin*; they thinking thereby to do *Calvin* a spight, forthwith release him. Afterwards, he having spread his Poyson in *France* and *Italy*, flies to *Poland*, where he joyns with *Blandrata* and *Alciat* to infect the *Polish* Church. Here not having staid more than two years, these Heresiarchs fall out among themselves; *Blandrata* turning down-right *Arian*, and *Alciat*, *Mahometan*; so *Gentilis* passes to *Moravia*, and strikes in for some time with the *Anabaptists* there, from thence he goes for *Austria*, and afterwards for *Savoy*; and so roving from place to place, and disseminating his Blasphemies, he came at last again into the Province of *Bern*, where being discovered, he was tried for several blasphemous Positions there and being convicted, was executed, persisting in his Heresy to the very last; *blasphemare simul & vivere desisse*.

*Idem.*

*Georgius Blandrata.*

*Georgius Blandrata*, who was another zealous *Unitarian* about this time, was a Physician by Profession, and propagated his Doctrines at Geneva, where he had several Disputes with *Calvin*, in whose Work is extant *Responsum ad Quaestiones Blandratae*; but he flew from thence presently after *Gentilis* did, suspecting that the Magistrates had a design against him too. From thence he went and practised Physick in *Poland* and *Transylvania*, thereby to have the better covert for his Heresy; and the more easily to instill it into Persons of the highest Quality. He wrote a Book in Answer to *Georgius Major*, against the Trinity, full of blasphemous Expressions, such as *Symbolorum de Patre & Filio fragmenta*, *Deum confusum & tripersonatum*, *ex tribus Personis compositum*; and calls the Orthodox *Tribeites*, and *Athenasius*, *Tribeitarum Antefig-*

*Antesignanum.* He got a great sum of Money by his Practice in the Polish Court, but was at last, as a signal Example of God's Vengeance, murdered in his Bed by his Nephew, whom he designed to make his Heir.

*Socin. in Anti-Wiek.*

*Paulus Alicanus*, who was the intimate Friend of *Blandrata*, and a busy *Unitarian* of this time, was born at *Millain* a Souldier by Profession, a Man of fiery Zeal for his Opinions, as appears by those blasphemous Expressions he used against the Trinity. For *Calvin* relates that he was wont to say, *That we worshipped in our Trinity three Devils, worse than all the Idols of the Papists.* So that the Divine Judgment was very Remarkable, in suffering him to fall away into the *Mahometan* Infidelity after so great Impiety.

*Paulus Alicantum.*

*Franciscus Stancarus*, a *Mantuan*, was now likewise a violent asserter of the same kind of Heresy; who tho' he began his Heterodoxy at first, by denying only Christ's Mediatorship as to his Divine Nature, yet he proceeded at last to deny the Persons of the Trinity, and with *Sabellius* to make God only *εὐλογουμένον*, one Person under three Names. He was, as *Zanchinus* says, a Learned Man, but only unquiet and proud, and too curious, which lead him into these Errors.

*Franciscus Stancarus.*

*Franciscus Lismaninus*, was another Heretick of this time of the same stamp, he was Doctor of Divinity, and formerly a *Franciscan* Monk, who after a pertinacious spreading of his Opinions, died mad.

*Franciscus Lismanin.*

*Bernardus Ochinus*, was another promoter of the *Anti-trinitarian* Doctrine; who, as *Beza* says of him, was something cunninger than the rest of the *Unitarians*, and like the Academicks, would seem rather to doubt of, than to define any thing. For in his Dialogues against the Trinity, he makes his other Collocutor to oppose the Trinity, and himself to defend it; tho' by such mean Arguments, as always gave away the Victory to his Antagonist: He was a favourer of *Polygamy* too, as appears by his 21 Dialogue; which has this Title thus made up of mirth and prophaneness; *To all Husbands that complain of their Wives, and all Wives that complain of their Husbands, Bernardus Ochinus wishes patience in Christ Jesus.* In which Dialogue, he lets his Antagonist, *Tetipolygamus*, strenuously make good his point against himself.

*Bernard. Ochinus. Beza. Ep. 81.*

*Franciscus Davidis*, was another very Famous one of these Hereticks, who assisted *Blandrata* in his Book against *Major*; he was Superintendent or Bishop, as *Sandius* says, of the *Unitarians* in *Transylvania*; but tho' he agreed with the rest of the *Unitarians* in denying the Divinity of our Saviour, yet he dissented from most of them about the Invocation of him, and did to his Death maintain, that as he was not God, so he was not to be worshipped.

*Franciscus Davidis.*

There

There were besides these several others, that were fore-runners to Socinus, or else cotemporaries with him, who did not agree to all the System of his Heresy, which now the Unitarians do generally maintain: Such as were *Nicolaus Parula* an Italian, a great Friend of *Laelius Socinus*; *Andreas Tricicinus Modrevius*, a Polish Knight; *Adam Pastor*, who had several Disputes with the Anabaptists; *Gregorius Paulus*, who was first a <sup>h</sup> *Tritheite*, and afterwards an Unitarian; *Petrus Statorius*, formerly *Beza's* Scholar; *Paulus Latomirskius*, and *Simon Budnau*, a violent man afterwards in the anti-adoration Faction; with several others<sup>i</sup>. But however, these at best were but Labourers or Coadjutors in the building up the Socinian Heresy; but the two great Master-builders were *Laelius* and *Faustus Socinus*, of whom now we come to speak.

<sup>h</sup> *Bez. Ep.*  
81.

<sup>i</sup> *Vid. Sand.*  
*Biblioth.*  
*Anti-trin.*

<sup>k</sup> *LÆLIUS*  
*SOCINUS.*

<sup>\*</sup> *Vit. Soc.*  
*cin. per Eq.*  
*Polon.*  
<sup>l</sup> *Id. p. 10.*

*Laelius Socinus*,<sup>k</sup> was born *A. D.* 1525. at *Siena* in *Tuscany* of a Noble Family; his Fathers Name was *Marianus Junior*, a famous Lawyer in *Italy* at that time; his Mothers Name was *Camilla*, the Daughter of *Paulus Salvettus*. He was an Auditor of *Servetus* when he was in *Italy*, and before he was of Age, he began to model a New System of Divinity upon the Unitarian Principles. He as the <sup>\*</sup> Author of the Life, says, <sup>l</sup> reading the Scriptures chiefly to further him in the Study of the Laws, and relying only upon his own Judgment, finds many of the Doctrines of the Church contrary to the Divine Testimony, as he thought, and therefore explains them, without farther search, according to his own Judgment. He, having thus for a considerable time been laying the Grounds of his Heresie, travelling into *England*, *France*, *Holland*, *Germany*, he fixed his seat, at last, at *Zurich* in *Helvetia*; yet not so, but that after this he goes twice into *Poland*, *A. D.* 1551, and again 1557; where he infected many of the Polish Nobility. He infected also his own Brothers *Celsus*, *Cornelius*, and *Camillus*, and *Faustus* his Brother *Alexander's* Son. And *Zanchius* in his Preface to his Book *de Tribus Elohim*, further says, *He, for many Years pursued the Samosetanian Heresie, and drew as many as he could into the same Errour, and those were not a few: He endeavoured likewise by many Temptations to pervert me into the same Errour, and to involve me in the same eternal Destruction with himself.* Whilst he lived at *Zurich*, or in his Travels, he contracted some Familiarity with *Melancthon*, *Brentius*, *Musculus*, *Bullinger*, and *Calvin*; and therefore *Calvin*, when he heard of his audacious Curiosity in Divinity, wrote to him, to dissuade him from it, *Si tibi per aëreas illas Speculationes volitare libet, sine me quaso humilem Christi discipulum ea meditari qua ad fidei meae adificationem faciunt.* You may, if you please, fly through these aereal Speculations, but suffer me, an humble Disciple of Christ, to meditate

tate



tate upon those things which serve to the Edification of my Faith. And now so many of the Family of the Socinus's being perverted by *Lalins*, the whole Family began to be suspected for Heresie; which brought a storm upon all the House; so that, as the Authour of the Life says, *the Harvest was spoiled in the Springing Blade*, *Conse- lius being imprisond, and the rest being either forced to fly, or afraid to profess their Opinion.* This Fear drove young *Faustus*, being now but Twenty Years old, not only from his place of abode but from *Italy*; who went to live for some time at *Lyons in France*, in the same Year, in which the Magistrates of *Basil* digged up the Body of *David George*, after he had been dead Three Years, and burned it. *Lalins* continu- ed still to study at *Zurick*, till he died, which was in the Year 1562. on the 16th. of *May*. He was the first that brought to light that no- tion of the Person of Christ, and his Sufferings, &c. which the So- cinians do since maintain, and was forming some great Designs for the furthering his Heresie, but did not live to perfect them. The only Books that he published, were the Dialogue between *Calvin* and *Fascianus*, against the persecution of Hereticks upon the occasion of *Servetus's* execution, in which he makes *Calvin* a great Instru- ment: which Book was reprinted in *Holland*, by some of the Remon- strant Party 1612. and has commonly been attributed to *Castellio*; though 'tis apparent it is not *Castellio's* by the Reflection that is made upon his Translation of the Scripture. He wrote likewise a Trea- tise of the Sacraments, and a Book *de Resurrectione Corporum*, publi- shed by *Crucellans*. Whatever other Designs he had projected, and whatever Books he wrote fell into his Nephew *Faustus's* hands; who made all the possible haste he could to *Zurick*, to secure his Books and Papers, fearing least it should fare with *Lalins*, as it had done before with *David George*.

1559.

*Faustus Socinus*, the Nephew of *Lalins*, was the Son of *Alexander* **FAUSTUS**  
*Socinus*, and of *Agnes*, the Daughter of *Burgessius Petruccius* Prince of **SOCINUS**  
*Siena*; by which he was related to Three Popes, *Pius II.* and *III.* and *Paul V.* He was born *December 5. 1539.* at *Siena*, being but Four- teen Years younger than his Uncle: and he being now dead, and *Fau- stus* having gotten his Books and Papers into his hands, he returns into *Italy*, being now at the Age of Twenty Three Years, and spends Twelve Years in the Court of the Duke of *Florence*.

And now whilst *Faustus* kept close in *Italy*, the Unitarian Cause was carried on by others, and not a little by *Castellio*, by publishing to the World *Ochinus's* Dialogues; of which *Faustus Socinus* says, \* *Hic*  
*sense of our Saviour Christ was plainly expressed and inculcated*; though  
vatore aperte expressam in illis esse & inculcatam. Ep. ad Marc. Vadovix.

\* Sententi-  
am suam de  
Christo Ser-

*Castellio*

*Castellio*, in his defence, said, he only published them as a Translator, being wont to get his Livelihood by translating Books. Neither were the *Unitarians* themselves wanting to carry on their design; for in the Year 1566, there was a Book printed at *Alba Julia*, with this Title, *Demonstratio falsitatis Doctrinae Pauli Adici, & reliquorum Sapientiarum, per Antistes, una cum refutatione Veri & Turci Christi*. And afterwards another, entitled, *De falsis & veris unius Dei, Pat. Fil. & Sp. Sancti. Cognitione*, supposed to be wrote by *Latinus Socinus*, though *Sandius* denies it, from the difference of the Style, &c. And about the same time, *Jacobus Acontius*, published his Book, call'd *Saxana Servitagemina*, which did considerable Service to the *Unitarians*. In the Year 1568, there came out a Book, set out by the Ministers and Seniors of the consenting Churches in *Transylvania*, *De Mediatoris Jesu Christi hominis divinitate aequalitateque*; in which, speaking of the Trinity, they say, *The Three-One God of Antichrist is buried*, and say, *It was wickedly done of the Roman Church to condemn those famous Fathers Berillus, Samosetanus, Arius, Donatus, Helvidius, Artemon, &c.* And in the Year 1569, They publish another, of the *Kingdom of Christ and Anti-christ*, with a Treatise of *Pado Baptism and Circumcision*; the Conclusion of which Book is this, *Whosoever does truly believe that the Pope is Anti-christ, does truly believe that the Trinity, and Infant Baptism, and the other Sacraments of the Papists, are the Doctrines of Devils*.

1570.

The next Year, being the Year 1570, *Faustus Socinus* published his first Book of the *Authority of the holy Scripture*, in *Italian*, afterwards turned by himself into *Latin*, and set out under the Name of *Dominicus Lopez*, at *Sevil*, 1588. and again set out by *Vorstius* at *Steinfort*, 1611. in which Book, says a \* Learned Man, instead of making good the Scripture's Authority against *Atheists*, he weakens it among *Christians*. In the Year 1574, he leave the Duke's Court, and comes to live at *Basil*; where he spends three Years in furbishing up that Model of Divinity, which was left him by his Uncle *Latinus*; for he himself, by his own Confession, was able then to add but little to them. For in his Answer to the defence of *Puccius*, he says, he understood not much of *Greek*, and but little or nothing of *Hebrew*. And indeed, *Forerius's* Lexicon was his whole Treasure of *Hebrew* Knowledge, which he was forced to recur to, upon all Occasions. His Knowledge in *Logic* was but small at best, and he had wrote + several of his Books before he had any Knowledge at all of it. In the Year, 1577. He published his Disputation *de Jesu Christo Servatore*, which

\* Hornbeck Soc. Conf. || Græcos enim Fontes, ut ego met omnibus dico, leviter admodum degustavi. Helæos vix dum attingi. Resp ad Det. Fran. Puccii. † Disputationes medicarum quadam quædam sunt cetera, cum modum dialecticæ illam operam dedissem, cuiusmodi est Disputatio de Servatore, adversus Puccium Palæologum, Fr. Davidis, &c.

he had with *Jacobus Socinus*, Pastor of the French Church at Basil. And in the Year 1578, he published another Disputation, of the *State of the First Adam before the Fall*, against *Franciscus Pucias*. In his Book *de Christo Servatore*, he revived first of the modern Unitarians, *Abelardus's* Heresy of the *Redemption and Satisfaction of Christ*; making the Merits of Christ to be purely exemplary. In the Year 1578, he sets out *Cassellius's* Dialogues of Predestination, Election, Free-will, and Faith, and writes a Preface to them, under the feigned name of *Felix Turpi Orbevetanus*. His Explication of the first of St. *John*, was wrote about the Year 1562, as he himself says, though not published till afterwards. In the Year 1581, he sets out his *Synopsis of Justification*; from which the *Remonstrants* since have borrowed so much. But in this Year there happened the great Schism among the Unitarians, concerning the Adoration of Christ; especially between *Blandrata* and *Franciscus Davidis*; the Ministers of *Alba Julia* siding with the one, and those of *Claudiopolis* or *Clausburg* with the other. Upon this, *Blandrata* invites *Socinus* into Poland, to be Moderator in this difference, and gets *Socinus* to lodge in the same house with *Fr. Davidis Blandrat*, during his stay, bearing all his Expenses.

So that within a few Months afterwards followed that famous Conference held at *Clausburg*, concerning the Invocation of Christ, which was afterwards Printed in the Year 1594. After the end of which Conference, *Franciscus Davidis* being very stiff in his Opinion, and his Antagonists exaggerating the Wickedness of it, he was forthwith imprisoned by Order of the Prince of *Transylvania*, and afterwards in a few Months was either made away there, or died. From hence was raised a great Clamour by the Anti-Adoration Party against *Socinus* and *Blandrata*, that they had been the Authors of this Persecution, which was so much credited, that they lost their Esteem with many. This forced *Socinus* to write an *Apology to the Transylvanians*, the Followers of *Franciscus Davidis*, to shew that *Franciscus* drew this Calamity upon himself, That contrary to his Promise given to him and *Blandrat*, he had procured several things in the Synod of *Thord*, to be decreed against the Invocation of Christ; and once, when he preached in the great Church, he expressly asserted, That it was the same thing to pray to Christ, as to pray to the Virgin Mary, or any other of the dead Saints. After the Death of *Franciscus Davidis* the Anti-Invocation Party in *Transylvania* were not quiet, but did resolutely maintain, That as Christ by Nature was not God, so without Idolatry he could not be worshipped; and for this side of the Controversie there appeared strenuously *Franciscus Davidis's* Son, *Radulphus*,

1579.

\* In the  
Title of his  
Book, *Quid  
Regni Po-  
lm. &c.*

*Glirius, Sommerus, and others, who in their Books and Discourses did grievously accuse Socinus and Blandrata. Socinus not being easie under all these Contradictions and Accusations, forthwith leaves Transylvania, and being now 40 Years old, goes for Poland, and there joyns himself to the Congregation of them, that following Servetus, do pray to Christ as the Son of the Eternal God, but not the Eternal Son; Who, as \*Socinus says, in Poland, and in the great Dukedom of Lithuania, are called Arians and Ebionites. And here he formed the remaining part of his Heresie, which differs so much from that of the other Unitarians before Socinus. For whereas Servetus and his Followers were content only to destroy the Doctrine of the Trinity, and to retain the other Points of Religion, he was for innovating in all, and in a strict sence, for teaching another Gospel. Thus he taught that the Principle and Foundation of Faith was in a Man of himself; Soc. Tract. de just. That justified Persons are in a State of unfinning Perfection, Syn. 2. de just. & Dial. de just. p. 14. That Mortality was necessary to Man if he had not sinned, Part. 3. de Serv. Chris. c. viii. That Adam had not the Promise of Eternal Life, nor could he avoid his Fall, Resp. ad def. Pucc. de prim. Hom. stat. & Lib. Suas. quod regn. Pol. &c. p. 56. That Christ was a new Legislatour, and gave Moral Laws, which were not so before, de Offic. Chr. p. 4. de Conv. & Diff. V. N. Test. p. 33. That Christ abrogated all the Judicial Precepts of the Law, as well as the Ceremonial, de Off. Chr. p. 5. that notorious Offenders are not to be punished with Death, ibid. That the Lord's Supper is not a Conveyance of Grace, but only an Act of Commemoration, Tract. de Coen. Dom. That Baptism is not necessary for Christians, that it was a Rite only of John and not of Christ, de Bapt. Aq. c. xvi. That it is a thing indifferent whether Children be baptized or no, or any other, that it is not a sin if they be, but it ought not to be enjoined, ibid. cap. 17. That the Messias was not promised to all the Jews, Frag. de justif. jux. fin. nor were they at all obliged to believe that the Messias should come, ibid. That Christ did not suffer and die for us, to rescue us from Punishment, but only to shew us an Example how we ought to suffer for Righteousness sake, Rel. Chr. brev. Inst. p. 87, 88. & brev. Disc. de rat. Sal. p. 15. That Christ was called our Saviour, because he manifested the Terms of Salvation to us, de Chr. Serv. c. 1, & 5. That he is called a Mediatour, not because he reconciles God and us, but because he was Embassadour from God to us, to reveal his Will, Rel. Chr. Inst. p. 85. That Christ ascended up into Heaven, before he entered upon his Prophetick Office, to be informed of God's Will, and therefore in Scripture when 'tis said Christ came down from Heaven, 'tis to be meant of his Descent after this Ascension, Rel. Chr. Inst. p. 127. in Disp. cum Erasmo Joh. Christ*

was



was not God before his Glorification, which was after the Ascension, and then he was so only by Office and Immortality, Anti-Wick. cap. 6. Rel. Christ. Inst. p. 25. That Christ was mere Man, and the Holy Ghost only an Attribut, Ibid. These and many more are the Heterodoxes of his Books, which the Socinians do at this day maintain, and others there are which are more covertly delivered in Socinus's Books, though more expressly asserted by his Followers; such as the denying an Eternity of Torments, and the rising again with the same Bodies, the Hints of which also they took from Socinus; so that in him, was in a manner wholly perfected the Heresie which does still go under his Name. 'Tis true, the Anti-Adoration Faction, who were the Followers of Frantsiscus Davidis and Symon Budnans, did a long time stiffly oppose him, but in the Synod of Brest in the Confines of Transylvania, he so cunningly managed the Matter, that though he chiefly pretended a Dispute for the Adoration, he brought the adverse Party to receive his Notions of the Death and Sacrifice of Christ, of Justification, and of the Corruption of Mens Nature, which they had lately condemned. Afterwards he drew over to his Opinion the famous Unitarian Petrus Statorius, a Man of a great Popular Eloquence, who made Socinus's Doctrines go down more easily with the People by his Pulpit Harangues. He himself too, by a strange artifice, brought over to his Heresy, every day, many of the better quality, several the Courtiers and Nobility that happened to abide at Lubernick, and several of the younger Clergy, that were not well grounded in their Religion. And none of the Unitarians, after a while, objected against this new mode of Socinus, but only Nemojevicius and Czechovicus, who resisted him strenuously for a time, and Nemojevicius, after a while too, assented to him, and Czechovicus, though he held out to the last, seeing no body to abett him, was forced to be still. So that within four years time, all the whole Church of the Unitarians, did subscribe to the Doctrines of Socinus, which they had so lately almost universally Condemned. Thus was this Heresy perfected, after so many struglings among the Unitarians themselves, which is swallowed down so crudely, and without consideration, by many in our Ages, that make pretence to the greatest Reason and Cautionness. Socinus lived several years after the general Reception of his Doctrines, and died in the year 1604.

1388.

The other Unitarians that have been famous since Faustus Socinus, have been but as the Schoolmen to Lombard, have commented only upon his Text, and only more audaciously sometimes explained his notions.

The first Unitarian of note, after Socinus had formed his Heresy, was.

was *Georgius Enjedinus*, an *Hungarian*, Superintendent of the Lutheran Churches in *Transylvania*, and Moderator of the *Gymnasium* at *Claußburg*. He was a follower of *Socinus* in most of his Doctrines, only in the matter of *Invocation*, which *Socinus* endeavours to dissuade him from, in a long Letter to him A. D. 1506. He wrote the celebrated *Socinian* piece upon the *Texts of the old and new Testament*, upon which the *Trinity* is grounded, though the other *Treats* attributed to him are doubted.

*Ostrodus.*

*Ostrodus* was another Disciple of *Socinus*; he was a *Saxon* by Birth, the Son of a *Lutheran* Minister; he was Master of a School for some time in *Pomerania*, but being found to be heretical in his Principles, he was deprived of that, and so in the year 1585. he came into *Poland*, where he was some time Minister of the *Unitarian* Church of *Gedan*. His most famous piece is his *Institutions* which he wrote in Dutch.

*Volkelius.*

*Flor. 1595.*

Next was *Johannes Volkelius* born in the Province of *Misia* in *Saxony*. His chiefest piece is his five Books *de verâ Religione*, or his *Institutions of Socinianism*, which was excellently answered by *Maresius*.

*Flor. An.*

1603.

*Ernstus Soverus*, a *Norimberg* Physician, Professor of natural Philosophy and Medicine at *Altorf*, he was the Master of *Crellius*. He wrote the famous Heretical piece against the Eternity of Hell Torments, Entitled *Demonstratio Theolog. & Philosophica, quod æterna impiorum supplicia non arguant Dei justitiam, sed injustitiam*. He died 1612.

*Smaltzius.*

*Kalensis Smaltzius*, by Birth a *Saxon*, of the Province of *Thuring*, Rector of the School of *Smigla*, afterwards of *Lublin*, and at last Minister of the Congregation of *Racow*, born A. D. 1572. He was most famous for his two pieces, the one *de Divinitate Jesu Christi*, in which he took away our Lords true Divinity, and gave him a Metaphorical one, such as the old *Divi* were supposed to have, after their *Arabian* use: the other the *Racovian Catechism*, in which he had the chiefest hand, though assisted somewhat by *Moscovicius*, and by the Catechism put out before by *Socinus* and *Starovius*. This was wrote first in Polish, and Printed at *Racow*, 1605. which afterwards *Moscovicius* translated into Latin; and had the confidence to Dedicate it to King *James I.* A. D. 1612. His chiefest Adversaries were *Smiglecius*, and *Franzius*, and *Schoppertus*. He died, *Crellius* says, 4 Decem. 1622.

*Crellius.*

1630.

*Johannes Crellius*, born at *Helmuthelms* in *Poland*, 1590. He was first Rector of the School at *Racow*, and afterwards Minister of the Congregation. His Life may be seen, as it is wrote by *Joachimus Pastorius*, and bound up among the *Frates Poloni*. He is most famous, besides for his Comments on Scripture, for his Book *de uno Deo Patre*, answered

answered by *Bischoff*. His Book of Satisfaction, in answer to *Gro-*  
*sius*, which was once admirably answered by the Bishop of Worcester.  
 He died 1633.

*Samuel Przypocievius*, a Polish Knight, born about the year 1590. *Przypocievius*  
 and died 1670. He wrote several pieces which were never published,  
*and Sand Biblioth.* but the most famous piece is the Life of *Pamphus*  
*Socinus*. There is attributed to him a celebrated Piece, Printed at  
*Eleutheropolis* 1630. *Anonymi dissertatio de pace Ecclesie*, thought at  
 that time to be wrote by *Simon Episcopus*, Professor of the Remonstrants  
 in *Holland*.

*Jonas Slichtingius*, a Bukowiec, a Polish Knight, was the next *Slichtingi-*  
*us* Socinian of note, his most famous Pieces are, his Confession of Faith,  
 and his Book of the Trinity and the Sacraments, against *Meisnerus*,  
 besides his Comments in the *Frates Poloni*. He died at *Zelichow* in the  
 Dutchy of *Brandenburg*, 1661.

*Johannes Lodovicus Wolzogenius*, was another late famous Socinian; *Wolzogeni-*  
 he was a Nobleman in *Austria*, but turning Protestant, he left his  
 Country, and settled in *Poland*, where, after a time, he embraced the  
 Doctrines of *Socinus*. His Works are many, the most considerable of  
 which are bound up with the *Frates Poloni*. He died 1658. *Florianus*  
*Crusius*, a Physician, *Petrus Morstodius*, and *Andreas Wissowarius*,  
 were famous Socinians likewise at the same time. 1650.

The Socinian Doctrines had hitherto contained themselves within  
*Poland* and *Transylvania*, and there was only some little Colony of  
 them lurking among the Remonstrants in *Holland*, but other parts of  
 the World were generally free from this infection, especially our Na-  
 tion, till in the time of the late Rebellion and Usurpation it became  
 the sink of all Heresies.

And then *John Bidel*, Master of Arts of the University of *Oxford*, *Mr Bidel*  
 brought in this Heresy here, and held a Congregation of Socinians in  
*London*. He wrote two Socinian Catechisms, a large one, and a shorter  
 for the use of the more ignorant; which were translated into Latin by  
 a young Scholar of his, one *Nathaniel Stuckey*, the Son of one *Mr*  
*Stuckey* a Cloathworker in *London*. He wrote likewise a Treatise a-  
 gainst the Deity of the Holy Ghost, wherein he does not follow *Soc-*  
*nius* in making him only an Attribute, but a Person, and one of the  
 higher rank of Angels. There were several Books of the Socinian  
 stamp published about that time, by some of the other Sectaries, as  
 one against the Eternity of Torments, entitled, *The twelve Pillars of*  
*Hell Torments shaken*, &c. and some other Papers of the same nature  
 sent abroad, which occasioned *Dr. Hammond* to write his Excellent  
 Treatise of Hell Torments.

Soon

1648.

Soon after this, in the year 1658. came out the *Edict of Janina*, King of Poland, against the *Swissians*, whereby the Statute of his Predecessour *Vladislaus* to be revived, and was in effect against the *Unitarians*; that no one, under pain of Death, should teach or profess that Religion: but if any one would continue in that Communion, they must within three years leave the Kingdom, which time should be allowed to dispose of their Effects and Possessions. But for some considerations or other this time was not exact, and in the year 1660. they who would not renounce their Heresy were forced to leave *Poland* and *Lithuania*, which accordingly many did, and settled, some in *Prussia*, some in *Silesia*, others in the *Margravate of Brandenburg*, and some in *Holland*.

Since which time *Christoph. Sandius* has been the only *Unitarian* of note, famed most for his *Nucleus Hist. Ecclesiasticae*, his *Tentamen de origine Animæ*, and his *Problema Paradoxum de spiritu Sancto*. Though in most points he was a *Socinian*, yet as to the matter of our Saviour's Person, he was a violent *Arian*. He was the Son of *Christopherns Sandius* a *Prussian* and *Unitarian*, who was Counsellour and Secretary to the Elector of *Brandenburgh*, but discovering his Perfection, was deprived of his Offices 1668. He was born at *Koningsberg* in *Prussia*, 1644. and died at *Amsterdam*. 1680.

\* In England we have since that time been free from this infection, all Mr. F——'s Papers of late came out, and the Book called the *Naked Gospel*; but God be thanked, the strength of these pieces is not so great, as to fear from them any mighty Contagion: For though they have all the Malice and Heresy, they have little enough of the Wit and Reason of the former Sermons.

## ERRATA

Pag. 51. lin. antepenult. pro *almost* leg. *most*. Pag. 58. dele *Q. of the*. Pag. 78.  
 Not. † leg. *Bas. Hon. de Par.* Pag. 79. leg. *stones ardent*.

**FINIS**

just ahead, while occasionally Dr. Hammond would write his 42c letters.



